A RETENTIVE, TO STAY GOOD CHRISTIANS, IN TRVE FAITH and religion, against the motiues of Richard Bristow.

ALSO

A DISCOVERIE OF THE DAVNGEROVS ROCKE OF THE POPISH Church, commended by Nicholas Sander D. of Diuinitie.

Done by William Fulke Doctor of diuinitie, and Maister of Pembroke hall in Cambridge.

1.F12

Imprinted at London by Thomas Vautroullier for George Bishop.
1580.

LIBRARY OF THE
UNION
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
NEW YORK

A CATALOGVE OF ALL SVCH POPISH BOOKES EITHER AVNSWERED, or to be aunſwered, which beeinge written in the Engliſh tongue from beyond the ſeas, or ſecretly diſperſed here in England haue come to our hands, ſince the beginning of the Queenes Maieſties reigne.

1 HArding againſt the Apologie of the Engliſh Church, aunſwered by M. Iewell, Biſhop of Sarum.

2 Harding againſt M. Iewells challenge, aunſwered by M. Iewell.

3 Hardings reioynder to M. Iewell, aunſwered by M. Edward Deering.

4 Coles quarrels againſt M. Iewell, aunſwered by M. Iewell.

5 Raſtels returne of vntruths anſwered by M. Iewel.

6 Raſtel againſt M. Iewels challenge, aunſwered by William Fulke.

7 Dorman againſt M. Iewel, anſwered by M. Nowel.

8 Dormans diſproofe of M. Nowels reproofe, aunſwered by M. Nowell.

9 The man of Cheſter aunſwered by M. Pilkington Biſhop of Dureſme.

10 Sanders on the Sacrament in part aunſwered by M. Nowell.

11 Fecknams Scruples, aunſwered by M. Horne B. of Wincheſter.

12 Fecknams Apologie, aunſwered by W. Fulke.

13 Fecknams obiections againſt M. Goughes ſermõ, aunſwered by M. Gough and M. Lawrence Toomſon.

14 Stapletons counterblaſt, anſwered by M. Bridges.

15 Marſhall his defence of the croſſe, aunſwered by M. Caulfehill.

16 Fowlers Pſalter, aunſwered by M. Sampſon.

17 An infamous libell or letter *(incerto authore)* againſt the teachers of Gods diuine prouidence & predeſtination, aunſwered by Robert Crowley.

18 Allens defence of Purgatory, aunſwered by W. Fulke.

19 Heſkins Parleament repealed by W. Fulke.

20 An offer of a Catholickque, to a learned Proteſtant, anſwered by W. Fulke.

21 Hoſius of Gods expreſſe word tranſlated into Engliſh, aunſwered by W. Fulke.

22 Sanders rocke of the popiſh church, vndermined by W. Fulke.

23 Sanders defence of Images anſwered by W. Fulk.

24 Marſhals reply to Caulfhill, anſwered by W. Fulk.

25 Shaclockes pearle, aunſwered by M. Hartwell.

26 The hatchet of hereſies, aunſwered by M. Bartlet.

27 M. Euans aunſwered by him ſelfe.

28 A defence of the priuate Maſſe, aunſwered (by coniecture) by M. Cooper Biſhop of Lincolne.

29 Certaine aſſertions tending to maintayne the Church of Rome to be the true & Catholique Church, confuted by Iohn Knewſtub.

30 Briſtowes motiues and demaunds, aunſwered by W. Fulke.

31 Stapletons fortreſſe of the faith, aunſwered by W. Fulke.

Theſe Popiſh treatiſes enſuing for the moſt part are in aunſwering, & thoſe vvhich are not (by Gods aſſiſtance as time vvill ſerue) ſhall receiue their ſeuerall replyes. If the Papiſtes knovv any not here reckoned, let them be brought to light, and they ſhall be examined.

1 Sanders, vpon the Lordes ſupper, partly vnaunſwered.

ſwered.

2 Allens defence of Prieſtes authoritie to remitte ſinnes, and of the Churches meaning concerning indulgences.

3 Stapletons returne of vntruthes.

4 Raſtells reply.

5 Vaux his Catechiſme.

6 Caniſius his Catechiſme tranſlated.

7 Frarins oration tranſlated.

8 Iohn de Albynnes diſcourſe againſt hereſies, engliſhed, with an offer of a Catholique to a learned Proteſtant: which offer is aunſwered vnder the name of Riſtons articles, by W. Fulke.

9 Gregor. Martins treatiſe of ſchiſme.

10 Poyntes of the Sacrament.

A REASONABLE REQVEST AND PROTESTATION OF W. Fulke to all learned Papists.

Forasmuch as there is no ende of writing bookes (as the wise man sayth) and that the truth of argumentes is best discerned when it is brought vnto the iudgement of Logicke, which is the arte of reasoning: If any of the learned Papistes will reply against these, and other mine aunsweres, I require that (as well for their owne ease, as that I may haue time to peruse them, and the readers no impediment, but that they may clearely iudge of them,) they wil leaue of all vayne discourses, and needelesse questions, and only conclude the cõtrouersies of religion that are betweene vs, in the strict forme of Logicall argumentes. If to this reasonable request they refuse to yeelde, I protest before God and the world, that they shew themselues thereby to be enemies of the truth, that they flie the light, and dare not abide the triall.

Faultes escaped.

The first number signifieth the page, the last the number of the lines.

Pag.12.lin.1. Homousian r. Homousion 13.10. last r.least 15.8. Arrius r.AErius 15.14. your r.there 15.18. vvherefore r.vvhereof 15.27.recited r.reuiued 20.26.Iudæa r.India 27.27. virtute r.vnitate 30.24.cõmaunded r.commended 34.32. other r.ether 36.33.heare r.hovv 40.14.circumstituantur r.circumstipantur 40.39 audient r.audirent 42.23.cere r.cura 44.10. condemned r.contẽned 44.36.caic r.con 45.18.true r.foure 48.37.Marcellus r.Marcellinus 55.19. Hovv r. Novv 58.15. persvvadeth r.presupposeth 67.38.r.in a maner depend 68.11.resisting r.receiuing 68.28.and r.an 73.1[illegible].quæq; r.quoq; 79.29. Ripanũ r.Riparium 80.35. Babicas r.Babilas 80.38.for r.to 81.7.troubles r.tombes 81.16.Reg r. [illegible].Reg.13. 81.17. lavves r. bones 82.30. verity r. vnity 87.10. contret r.cõteret 88.2.sending r.studying 88.33.αὐτοκύριος 88.36.αὐτοφος 89.14.v 11.r.14. 90.36.nor r.are 90.38. r.vvere not better applied 92.37.ber.2.r. ver.21. 25. learning r.hearing 95.14.r.if by masse 95.25. consecrated r. vnconsecrated 96.34. that the churches of the Britans vvere of another forme then those of the Romanes 96.35.Niua r.Ninia 99.18.names r.nonus 100.19. serueth r.seemeth 100.30.austerity r. authority 103.9. apostolicall r.apostaticall 107.21. all our 111.11.saue r.serue 112.38.truly r.fondly 116.7.shall r.should 117.36.Bzia r.Bizari 120.23.not r.out 122.2.mã r.may 123.5.rehearsed r.released 131.23. do not vvell r.do vvell.

Out of the discouery of the rocke.

Pag.140. Lin. 25. if read that.141. 28. or r.&c. 144.24. fuit r. sint.150.14.receyued r.recited.20.r.these tvvo.155.l.vlt.Rhetianus r.Rhetitius.158.2.controuersie r. conuersion.159. 5. many r. men.163.31.vilant r.vigilant.165.26.this r.these.167.4 not r.as. l.vlt.r.vvhich ma y.173.30.confirmed r.considered.176.24.godlines r. lordlines. 177.34. that r.this.true r. tvvo.189.6. vvhen r. vvhom.l.12.put out prayse 204.30. instituteth r.intituleth. 208.35.offered r.before made. 228.7. vnee r.ounce. 232.11.r that it. l.15.Cæbastinus r. Cælestinus. 233. 5. generally r.generall. 236.13.austerity r.authority.256.1.and r.no.250.32. fostered r.fastened.247.3.idio r.ideo.272.32.that r.the. 260.3.petram r. Petrũ. 276.6.den r.doome. 279.3. deforme r. defame. 280. 14. vncertainly r.vnreuerẽtly.l.38.vvith r.vvhich.281.4.challeng r.calling. 297.17.Barbarita r.Borberitæ.314.13.Cyrians r.Collyridianes.

A

A RETENTIVE TO STAY GOOD CHRISTIANS IN THE TRVETH OF THE GOSPELL, WRITTEN BY *W Fulke* againſt the Motiues of R. Briſtow, and by him directed to his *friends of the Popiſh Church.*

AMong ſuch Engliſh papiſtes, as haue written within theſe twentie yeares, againſt the religion of God nowe mainteyned by publike authoritie in this Realme, ſome haue ſhewed greate witte, ſome muche readinge, ſome flowing eloquence, ſome all theſe indifferently: but among them all, none hath ſhewed leſſe witte, learning, or good vtterance, then this Richard Briſtow. So much the more doe I meruell, when I heare that many Papiſtes make ſo great accompt of his witleſſe and ſenſeleſſe writinges. But it fareth with them, as with litle children, to whome newe trifles ſeeme alwayes moſt worthy to be played with al. And verily I had thoughe of all other, leaſt to haue delt againſt this peuiſh prater, both becauſe he bringeth no newe matter, but ſuch as in other of his cote, was with more coullor of trueth ſet foorth before, and alſo for that I had alreadie made

aunſwere to Ryſhtons challenge, which as I take it, is that table of the Church, which Briſtowe confeſſeth to conteine all his demaundes, whiche demaundes are almoſt all conteined in his motiues. But my friendes requiring mee not onely to aunſwere this, but all other writinges alſo of the papiſtes, what ſoeuer they haue ſet foorth in the engliſhe tongue ſince the happie raigne of our ſoueraigne Ladie, I haue condeſcended to confute euen that which deſerueth no confutation, and ſomewhat the rather, becauſe Briſtow would haue this alone to bee a ſufficient motiue vnto poperie, that *wee hauing nothing to gainesay moſt of their popiſh bookes, haue not dared,* (I vſe his owne wordes) *once to goe about the aunſwering of moſt of the ſaide Catholikes bookes. But are faine to get them forbidden by proclamation, although the ſelues haue prouoked confidently the Catholikes to write them.* Whervppon alſo he noteth that Iewels challenge is turned into proclamations, how rightly or truly, he that hath but halfe an eye may ſee. His preface to the reader, conteining neuer an argument or motiue, which is not repeated either in the treatiſe it ſelf of motiues, or in the demaundes, I will paſſe ouer, and come to the firſte motiue, gathering the principall contentes out of his owne table, as I haue done with the reſt.

Briſtow. *Name of Catholikes. The verie name of Catholikes a certaine marke of right Catholikes. Iewel vnwars teſtifieth the Romane religion to be Catholik. Lawrence Hüfreis Troian horſe, his pſeudocatholics. Luthers conſciens the Catholike Church to be againſt him. Pontacus erred not whoſe hiſtorie Humfrey himſelfe vnawars confirmeth. For Catholikes (ſaith he) were preſent as lookers on and earneſt defenders. What then? but none ſuch were moderators ſaue onely lay Lordes and vnlearned heretikes. ergo.*

Fulke. The firſt motiue is the 6. demaunde. In whiche he woulde proue the verie name of Catholikes, to whō ſoeuer it is giuen, to be a certain marke of right Catho-

likes

likes, to be knowen as readely, eaſely, and certainely by that name, as ſuch a citie is knowne by the name of London, and ſuch a countrie by the name of England. If euer he learned any logike at Oxforde, he left it behinde him, or elſe loſt it by the way when hee ranne ouer the ſea. For if all thinges may bee knowen by the name whereby they are cõmonly called, nothing beareth a falſe name, all Idoles are true gods and ſaintes, al deade carcaſes be liuing men. Yea all heretikes which are commonly called Chriſtians in reſpecte of Iewes & Turkes, be true Chriſtians. But we muſt bring him a companie of men, commonly knowne by the name of Catholikes, which proued heretikes. Forſooth the Arrians among themſelues were commonly called by the name of Catholikes and ſo reputed and taken, when the true Catholikes were called homouſians and heretikes, yea all heretikes among the Pagans were cõmonly knowen by the name of Chriſtians, whiche I thinke is as glorious a name as the name of Catholikes. Yet Auguſtine (ſaith hee) maketh much of the name of Catholikes. *Cont. Ep. Fund. c. 4. Tenet me poſtremò, &c. Laſt of all the verie name of the Catholike Church doeth holde me, which not without cauſe, amongeſt ſo many hereſies, this Church alone hath ſo obteined, that whereas all heretikes would haue themſelues to be called Catholikes yet to a ſtraunger which aſketh where men meete at the Catholike Church, none of the heretikes dare ſhewe either their minſter or houſe.* But let vs ſee howe Auguſtine and Briſtow agree. Auguſtine maketh this name, the laſt motiue, Briſtowe the firſt. Auguſtine ioyneth it with many thinges, Briſtowe maketh it alone to be a ſufficient motiue. Auguſtine in the nexte ſentence after confeſſeth the playne demonſtration of the trueth, whereſoeuer it may be ſhewed, to bee preferred before al thoſe motiues of Vniuerſalitie, miracles, conſente, ſucceſſion and name of Catholikes, by which he ſaith that he might be helde in the Catholke Churche, although he grounded no argument vppon that wiſedome, which the Maniches would not acknowledge to

" be in the catholike church, his words are these: *Apud vos*
" *autem vbi nihil horum est quod me imitet ac teneat, sola per-*
" *nat veritatis pollicitatio, quæ quidem suam manifesta monstra-*
" *tur, vt in dubium venire non possit, præponenda est omnibus illis*
" *rebus quibus in Catholica teneor*. Among you Maniches
" (saith he) where there is none of these thinges whiche
" might allure and hold me, the onely promisse of trueth
" doth sounde, whith trueth if it be shewed so manifeste
" that it cānot come in doubt, it is to be preferred before
" al those things, by which I am holde in the Catholike
" Church. This is Augustines iudgement of such simple motiues, which with the trueth, may helpe to confirme it, but are not worth a straw when they are alledged against the truth. Wherfore seing we make so plaine demonstration of the trueth out of Gods word, that no mā can doubt of it, but such as will followe the bare name of Catholike, contrarie to the Catholike doctrine of the scriptures: against all such vaine motiues, wee may be bolde to oppose the trueth it selfe. What a mockerie is this that hee saith? that an heretike in Germanie, being asked where the Catholike Church is, will point to ỳ popish Church. Admit this to be so, doth this proue the Massing Church to bee the Catholike Church? In France if you aske a Papist which is ỳ reformed Church? he will point you to the place where the congregation of true Christians vse to assemble. Doth the Papist therfore acknowledge, the Church of protestantes to bee in deede the reformed Churche? If hee doe not, the name of Catholikes proueth no more on the one syde, thē the name of reformed Christians on the other side, that either is such in deede, as of the vulgare and ignorant people they are called. *But why are Protestantes & all heretikes desirous to be called Catholikes? but that they which in deede haue the name, are also in deede euermore true Catholikes, and so the name alone sufficient to moue any man.* Who euer heard such an asse braye? as though there were no difference, whether they haue the name rightfully or wrongfully, truely or falsely. In all the Easte Church,

who

who are called Catholikes, but the Grecians? Which for many hundreth yeares, haue bene ſeparated ſtom the Communion of the Latines, and of them are compted for heretikes and Schimatikes. But Auguſtine *de vera rel.* Cap. 7. writeth more plainly for the name of Catholike. *Tenenda eſt nobis Chriſtiana &c. Wee muſte holde the Chriſtian religion, and the companie of that Church, which is Catholike and called Catholike, not onely of her owne, but alſo of her enemies. For will they nill they, the heretikes alſo and Schiſmatikes themſelues, when they talke not with their own, but with ſtrangers, they call the Catholike Church nothing but the Catholike Church. For they can not elſe bee vnderſtanded, excepte they diſcerne her by that name, by which ſhee is called of the whole world.* This therefore (quoth Briſtow) is proued, *they to be Catholikes that Catholikes are called.* When as Auguſtine ſaith, we muſt hold ỹ church which both is catholike, & is ſo called. Briſtowe the Papiſt, is called by the name of a Cittie in England, therefore Briſtowe the Papiſt is in deede a citie in England. This therefore is proued, that to bee Briſtow that Briſtow is called. But how proueth he, that they be called Catholikes? The worlde forſooth beareth them witneſſe. For beſide ſome ignorant fellowe in Germanie, that calleth them ſo, or rather not meaning to brable in the ſtreat, yealdeth to that tearme, not becauſe hee thinketh them to bee ſo, but becauſe he knoweth the Papiſt which aſketh for the Catholike Church, ſeeketh not the Catholike Church in deed, but the Popiſh Church falſely called Catholike: beſide I ſay ſome tankarde bearer boye or gyrle, that hath made ſuch aunſwere to Briſtowe as he trauelled in Germanie, he aſketh when in printed bookes they bee called Catholikes, whether the reader knoweth not who is meaned? Yes verily, if the bookes bee written by papiſtes, or ſuch as take neither part. But he would know further why we nicke name thé & call them Cacolikes or Cartholikes. I ſuppoſe whoſoeuer mocketh them, it is becauſe they falſely vſurpe that name, which they are not worthie to beare, and not becauſe they bee ſuch,

and the name euill: yet againe he asketh *why Luther in Germanie did cause the Creede to be turned, I beleeue the Christian Church, and not, I beleeue the Catholike Church.* Mine answere is, I beleeue that Bristowe belyeth Luther, for any such change of the creede, although he might well expoũd the true Catholike Church by the name of the true Christian Church. But Iewel confirmeth the name of Catholike to be theirs, or els *what meaneth he to entitle his replie, Against the Romane religion which of late hath ben accompted Catholike.* Alas poore Bristow, hast thou no better reason to proue the Popish Church to be Catholike, but that Iewel saith it hath bene accompted Catholike, and proueth that it hath ben falsely accompted so? Yes sir, not he only, but also *Pope Humfrey in his legend of saint Iewel, confesseth vs to be Catholikes, where he saith that Pontacus erred, when he wrot that onely Lay men neither learned nor Catholikes, were moderators in the disputation at Westminster.* Why Bristow, are you not ashamed to take the name of the lorde your god the Pope in vaine? And because Pontacus complaineth that catholikes were not moderators, doth Humfrey therefore acknowledge papistes to be Catholikes? yea forsooth, he doth so, and also cõfirmeth the storie of Pontacus, when he saith, *Catholikes were presens*, but in the next worde he expoundeth what catholikes, namely papistes. And som of thẽ were also moderators, at the least wise one, namely D. Heath then occupying the place of the Bishop of Yorke, therefore not onely lay Lords, & vnlearned heretiks, as this lewd losel and vnlearned dogbolt & trayterous papist (I am bold with him, because he is so malepert with the learned & godly nobilitie of England) most slaunderously and maliciously affirmeth, were only moderators of that disputation, but some of ỹ Popish faction were not only present but presidents of that action, beside all the rest of the popish prelates, which then were of the Parliament, for information whereof that conference was appointed. But Humfrey saith moreouer, that the chiefe cause of all euils, and as it were the Troian horse with-

in

in the walles of the Church, hath beene hitherto a Catholike defection from the holy ſcripture, and eſpecially your papiſtrie. Therefore (ſaith Briſtow) hee acknowledgeth vs to be Catholikes. In deed you be catholike (that is to ſay vniuerſal reuolters frō ỹ holy ſcriptures) if that title pleaſe you, reioyce of it & ſpare not. You be Catholike heretiks, that is, heretikes not in one or two articles of religion, but in all, in as much as you denie the office of Chriſte vpon which is grounded all Chriſtianitie. The name of Catholike of it ſelfe is indifferent to good and euil, euen as the name of vniuerſall is: therefore in our Creede we ſay not ſimplie, I beleeue the Catholike Church, but the holy Catholike Church. And therfore D Humfrey in calling you *pſeudocatholici*, falſe Catholikes, ſheweth what Catholikes he meaneth you to be, not members of the holy Catholike Church of godly Chriſtiās, but pillers of the falſe and counterfeit Church of malignant heretikes. And whereas you ſay, you haue hearde *Humfrey in his fond and vnlearned lectures at Oxford call them pſeudocatholici, whome Fauſtus the Maniche did entwite for honouring the memorie of Martyrs*, firſt you take vpon you like the ſowe to entwite Minerua as it is in ỹ latine prouerb, which might better be borne withall, in a man of ſuch learning and arte as you ſhew, if you did not alſo ſlander & belie him, as the diuell doth all the ſaintes of God. For although I neuer heard any of his lecturs: yet I dare affirme, he neuer accompted Auguſtine and ỹ godly Catholiks of his time for falſe Catholikes, although hee coulde not allowe of all that Auguſtine hath written and mainteyned. Wherefore it is cleare hee calleth not Auguſtine and the Catholikes of his time, but you Papiſtes of our time, falſe Catholikes: and ſhewed that to you did truly agree, that which Fauſtus did falſely charge ỹ true Catholikes with all, ỹ is, the turning of Idols into Martirs. For Fauſtus did ſlander, & not as you trāſlate it, onely entwite the true Catholikes for worſhipping the Martirs, as ỹ pagans worſhipped their Idols. *Calumniamur*

nobis Fauſtus &c. Fauſtus doth ſlander vs (ſaith Auguſtine) Againe: *Non tã me mouet ut hic Calumniæ reſpondeam &c.* He doth not ſo much moue me that I ſhould here anſwere his ſlander, as that I might ſhew, ỳ Fauſtus him ſelfe through deſire of ſlandering, would ſwarue euen from the vanities of Maniche. The laſte authorite for the name of Catholike in the 6. demaund is the words of a ſeruing man belike, that ſayd to one M. Culpeper which died at Paris, lying on his deth bed, *In any caſe renounce the Catholike faith*, which whether it were ſaid ſo, or howſoeuer it were ment, I thinke the partie that ſo ſpake, had as much wiſedome as Briſtow ſheweth wit, in alledging his ſaying for proofe of the name of Catholikes, to be rightly giuen to them. The fantaſticall trance of ỳ ſame gentleman which ſaw his good angel glorioufly appearing to him, & aſſuring him that hee was in the right way, which his goſtly father could not do, although it were not forged, yet can make no preiudice againſt the vndoubted word of God, which condemneth that way of papiſtrie, for the broad waye that leadeth to deſtruction. You haue heard what inuincible reaſons Briſtow imagineth ỳ he hath brought to proue the papiſtes to be right Catholikes. Firſt becauſe they call themſelues ſo. Secondly becauſe ignorant perſons giue them that name. And laſt of all becauſe ſome learned men call thẽ falſe Catholikes, counterfeit Catholikes, Catholike heretiks. But as the Iudge of the conference that was betwene the true Catholiks & the Donatiſtes ſaid to the Donatiſtes, whẽ they challenged vnto thẽ the name of Catholikes, ſo anſwere I to the papiſtes, *illos quærere magis ſe eſſe Catholicos dicerent, tanto magis iam cauſã ipſam remotis magarum interpoſitionibus agere debere, in qua probare poſſent ſe potius eſſe Catholicos*, that the more they vant themſelues to be Catholiks, ỳ more they ought all delayes being remoued, now to go to the cauſe it ſelfe, in which they might proue that they are Catholikes in deede, rather then we.

The

The ſecond motiue is the ſeauenth demaunde.

Name of Heretikes, that very name a certayne marke of very Heretikes. Luthers conſciens his ſide to be Heretikes. Briſtow.

If the very name of Heretikes were a certayne marke of Heretikes, the Chriſtians in the Apoſtles time ſhoulde bee verye Heretikes, for they were ſo called. yea (ſayth Briſtow) of the blind and vnbeleuing Iewes, and ſo are we called by the blind and vnbeleeuing Papiſtes: ſo were all true Catholikes alwayes by al Heretikes, which is ſo ſtrange to Briſtow, that he would haue vs bring an Example of any Chriſtians that euer called any people Heretikes, whiche prooued not Heretikes indeede. You may ſee his reading is very great, whiche thinketh no exception may be brought out of any Hiſtorie, or writings of the Fathers, for this matter. I wyll ſende him to that vnperfecte worke vpon S. Mathewes Goſpell, written by an Arriane, yet among Papiſts commonly taken for Chryſoſtom, wherein the Author calleth and counteth the true Chriſtians Heretikes, which defendeth the Godhead of the Father, the Sonne, and the holy Ghoſt to be equall, in Cap. 23. Hom. 45. *Conſequenter & hæreticis dicitur hoc.* conſequently this is ſaid to the Heretikes. And leaſt you ſhould doubt whome he calleth Heretikes, it followeth immediately: *Quando enim vides hæreticos tres per omnia æquales dicentes eiuſdem eſſe ſubſtantiæ, eiuſdem eſſe authoritatis, ſine principio omnes hos aliqua parte diſtantes a ſe, non mireris: implent enim menſuram patrum ſuorum Gentilium, quoniam & illi ſimiliter multos deos colebant.* For when thou ſeeſt the Heretikes, ſaying, that there be three in al things equal of the ſame ſubſtance, and of the ſame authoritie, all theſe being without beginning, yet differing in ſome reſpect one from another, maruell not: for they fulfill the meaſure of theyr fathers the heathen men, for they did likewiſe worſhip many Gods. By this one example in ſtead of many, it is cleere, that the Arrians did as commonly call the true Fulke.

Christians heretikes, as the true Christiãs called thẽ so. But if Bristow cauil, ỹ the Arrians were not Christians. I answere, they were as good Christians as the Papistes, who only almost cal vs heretiks, euen as we do likewise cal them. And it were a shameleſſe begging of the principle, to require that we shuld accompt Papists for true Christians, whẽ the question is whether they be heretiks or no. But it is a fine quarel ỹ he piketh against our trãslations of the Byble, where we cal *Hereticum* a man that is author of Sectes, as though we feared to call hym an Heretike, least men should thinke the Apostle spake against vs. Nay Bristow, thei ỹ so trãslate, would haue Englishmen to vnderstand when S. Paule calleth an Heretike, that they mighte acknowledge the Pope to be an Archheretike, bycause he is an author of so many Sects, contrary to the word of God. Neyther did ỹ Author of the Apollogie meane, that men should lesse auoide Heresies, accounted by S. Paul among ỹ works of the flesh. Gala. 5. where he alledged that S. Paules doctrine was called Heresie of the Iewes, Act. 24. or that they should not thinke ill of thẽ, which are adiudged Heretikes by true Christians, but that they should no more regard ỹ slanderous and malitious rayling of the Papistes, than the Apostles did of the Iews, who were not much worse thã the Papists, & in some things were more tollerable. Last of all, where Luther cõfesseth, that the members of the true Church were commonly called Heretikes, his conscience did not accuse him, ỹ his side were Heretiks, for he was able to put a difference betwene him that by heretiks is called an Heretike, and him ỹ is so in deede, although Bristow, eyther for his blockish wit can not, or for his spitefull malice will not conceyue it.

The third motiue is the eyght Demaunde.

Bristowe. *Name of Protestantes, Nicolaites, Papists, a name of late put on vs by Heretikes. Rechabites, Christians, and Catholikes are all one. S. Hieroms motiue name, as of Protestantes, Homousians: Name of Franciscanes. &c.*

Who

Whosoeuer in respect of ye doctrine which they professe (saith Bristow) haue a new name made of some mãs name, or otherwise taken vp, wherby they terme themselues, and are cõmonly termed and knowen thereby, vndoubtedly are heretiques. Therefore Lutherans, Caluinistes, Precisians, Puritanes, vnspotted brethren are heretiques, euen as the Nicolaitanes were. I deny ye conclusion. For there are none of vs that terme our selues Lutheranes, Caluinistes, Precisianes, Puritanes, vnspotted brethren &c. The name of Protestants, if any doe vse, is not in respect of the doctrine wee professe, but in respect of a protestation made against the decree of Spire in Germanie. Neither is it otherwise acknowledged of vs, then the name of Nazarites, was of the Apostles, the names of Homousians, Cæsarians, & Cæcilianists, was of the Christians in the time of the heresies of Arrius & Macedonius, Eunomius, Donatus &c. Paule was accused by Tertullus, Act. 24. to be a chiefe Capteine of the heresie of the Nazarites, whereunto he answered: This I confesse, that according to that way which they call heresie, doe I worship the God of my Fathers. That heretique which did write the vnperfect worke vpon S. Matthewes Gospel, which goeth vnder the name of S. Chrysostome, in *Cap. 24. Hom.* 48. thus writeth of ye true Christians. *Hęresis Homoousianorum, nõ solùm Christi ecclesiæ aduersatur, sed & omnibus hæresibus non similiter sapientibus.* The heresie of the Homousians, is not only aduersarie to the Church of Christ, but also to all other heresies that bee not of their minde. Here note, that the Arrians did giue a newe name to the true Christians, in respect of their doctrine wherof they were not ashamed. For Homousians signifieth them, that acknowledged the Father and the Sonne to be of the same substance. And ouer this note also: that the Arrian heretique did brag as much of the name of the Church then, as the Popish heretiques do nowe. Basil in his *Epist.* 73. testifieth the same of the Arrians. *Cęterum & Nicænam fidem calumniantur, nósque Homousiastas probrosè vocant, propterea quod in ea fide filium*

Fulk. 6

Dei

" *Dei vnigenitũ cum Deo ac patre Homousian confitemur.* More-
" ouer, they slaunder the faith of the Nicen Counsel, and
" call vs reprochfully Homoousians, bycause that in that
" fayth we confesse the onely begotten sonne of God to
" be of the same substance with the Father.

But Bristow sayth, it is a rule that the ancient Fathers alwayes gaue the people to knowe Heretikes thereby if they had any such name. Hieronyme Aduers. Luciferiã. sayth, *Sicubi audieris, &c.* If any where thou heare, thẽ
" which are sayd to be of Christ, to be tearmed not of our
" Lorde Iesus Christe, but of some other, as Massionites,
" Valentinians, Montenses, Camputes, knowe thou, that
" they are not the Church of Christ, but the Sinagog of
" Antichrist. But he belyeth Hierome, for he giueth not the name only as a sufficiẽt note, but before the words
" by Bristow cited, he writeth, *In illa esse ecclesia permanen-*
" *dum, quæ ab apostolis fundata, vsq; ad diem hanc durat.* We
" must tarie in that Church, which being founded by the
" Apostles, continueth vnto this day. And immediately
" after Bristowes pretended rules *Ex hoc enim ipso quod po-*
" *stea constituti sunt, eos se esse iudicant, quos futuros apostolus præ-*
" *nunciauit.* For euen by this, that they are set afterward,
" they shewe themselues to be the same, whome the A-
" postle foreshewed to come. By these wordes it is euident, that Hieronymes rule runneth not onely vppon the name, howsoeuer it beginneth, but of the late spring of Heretikes, whose doctrine being not founded by the Apostles, hath a later beginning after them. The names of Franciscanes, Dominicanes, Benedictines &c. whiche certayne sects of Papistes giue vnto themselues, Bristow sayth, they haue not for any speciall doctrine brought in by their Patrones, and therefore they be no names of Heretikes. But I reply, that beside that diuers of these sectes, dissent in poyntes of doctrine, as the Dominicanes and Franciscanes aboute Originall sinne. And to omitte the Guelphes and Gibellines, dissenting about the authoritie of the Pope and the Emperour, the greatest question in Popery, euen those sectes of Bene-

dictines

dictines, Auguſtines, Dominicanes &c. did al take their names, eyther of that man, or that order, whiche they held to be the perfection of Religion, conſiſting not in keeping the commaundemeentes of God, as Briſtowe like a wyſe man affirmeth, whiche all Chriſtian men ought to endeuour, but in keeping the traditions and conſtitutions of men, ſtanding in garments, in meates, in geſture, in ceremonies, & outward obſeruatiõs. wherfore they can not ſo lightly be acquitted of Hereſie, euen by Hieronymies owne rule, and laſt of all by the example of the name of Rechabites, who had their name of their family, and not of any Sect in perfection. The name of Papiſts (ſaith Briſtow) is lately put vpõ vs by heretiks, the like ſay we of the names of Lutheranes, &c. put vpon vs by them. The ſaying of Auguſtine, *De vtilitate credendi, Cap. 7.* toucheth vs not, that Heretikes dare not denye their names by whiche they are called, for we vtterly denye all names by which we are called, in reſpect of our Religion, to be drawen from men, and aunſwere onely to the name of Chriſtians. And as for the name of Catholikes, which Briſtow maketh all one with the name of Chriſtians, being added to the name of Chriſtians to diſtinguiſh true Chriſtians from Heretikes, which are counterfet Chriſtians, we do embrace it: but if from this righte meaning of the name, it bee drawen to ſignifye a people, whiche by only glorying in that name, deſpiſe al true Chriſtianitie grounded vpon the holy and diuine Scriptures, as Briſtow ſeemeth to make it, then is it no better thã a name of Heretikes, and ſo the name of Catholikes, boaſted of by them that refuſe to be members of ỹ holy Catholike Church, turneth to their owne reproch, euen as the name of the Apoſtolikes was to them, whiche bragged of the name of the Apoſtles, but were indeed no true followers of ỹ Apoſtles, no more than the Papiſtes be true Catholikes.

In the eyght Demaund, he would know why we call them not Gregorians, or Leonians, of ſome one Pope, but Papiſts of the generall name of the Pope. I anſwer, bycauſe

bicause they mainteine not one heresie only of one mā, but a general heresie and Apostasie from Christ, wherof the Pope is ỳ head, whom no more fooliſhly then falſly Briſtowe ſaith to haue bene alwayes ſince the Apoſtles time. If he preſſe vs, that we make not dangerous, to acknowledge the name of Proteſtants, I confeſſe, ỳ when nothing is vnderſtod by that name, but men which profeſſe that true doctrine which we doe, we greatly ſtriue not for the name. S. Paul him ſelfe openly acknowledged ỳ he was a Phariſee, when nothing was vnderſtoode by the name but one that beleeued the reſurrection of the dead, although ỳ terme of Phariſee was otherwiſe the name of a ſect of heretiques, which mainteined many damnable errours, from which the Apoſtle was moſt free. Laſt of all Auguſtine in *Breui. Coll. cum Donatiſt. Coll* 3. *diei* counteth all theſe three motiues of the name of Catholiques, Heretiqnes, and Proteſtants, to be but dilatorie ſhifts of the Heretiques, not ſound arguments of the Chriſtian Catholiques. *Vbi cognitor cùm dixiſſet, hoc Catholici probare debebunt, ortus eſt iterũ moratorius conflictus, de Catholico nomine & Donatiſtarum & Cæcilianiſtarũ.* When the Iudge or Commiſſioner had ſaid: This the Catholiques ought to proue: there aroſe againe a dilatorie conflict about the name of Catholique, and of the Donatiſtes, and of the Cæcilianiſtes. The Donatiſtes which were heretiques, chalenged to them ſelues the name of Catholiques, as the Papiſtes do againſt vs, the true Chriſtians they called Heretiques and Cæcilianiſtes, as the Papiſtes call vs, Heretiques, Proteſtants, Lutherans, &c. but theſe were but dilatorie deuiſes of Heretiques, to auoyd the true trial, which as the Catholikes in the forenamed conference confeſſed, was onely by ỳ Scriptures.

The 4. motiue is the 38 demaund.

Briſtow. *Olde hereſies. Arrians againe aliue in Proteſtantes. Proteſtants be Pelagians, in denying Baptiſme to be neceſſarie for the ſaluation of Infants. Heretiques are not Chriſtians.*

What

Whatſoeuer was hereſie in times paſt (ſaith Briſtow) Fulke.
is hereſie now alſo, ſome opinions holden by the Proteſtants, were hereſie in times paſt, Ergo, they be hereſies now alſo, ſo Proteſtants be Heretiques, and no Chriſtian, but almoſt Apoſtates. But I deny that any opinion holden by vs, was euer Hereſie. Yes ſaith Briſtow, the denying of prayer and oblation for the dead was accounted hereſie in Aërius, both by Epiphanius and Auguſtinus. True it is, they both following the errour of their times, account it for an errour in Aërius, but it doth not followe, that bicauſe they accounted it ſo, that it was ſo in deed, ſeing neither of them both doth proue it to be an errour by the authoritie of the holy Scriptures, but by the corrupt vſage of your Churches, which had turned thankeſgiuing for the dead, into prayers and oblation for the dead And yet the ſame Epiphanius denyeth faſting and almes to bee profitable to the dead, wherefore the Papiſtes do now hold the contrarie. *Contra Melchiſedec ſimus Hær.* 53. Hee accounteth the hauing of the images of Chriſt and the Apoſtles, one of the hereſies of the Gnoſtikes, *Hær.* 27. & many ſuch like things which the Papiſtes defend for Catholike. The like doth Auguſtine, wherefore let Briſtow aduiſe him ſelfe whether it be a good argument. Epiphanius and Auguſtine accounted prayer for the dead to be an errour, Ergo, it was an hereſie in deede? For an other example of old hereſies by vs recyted, he bringeth in, *That cruell hereſie of theirs, againſt the neceſſitie of childrens baptiſme, wherin they agree with the Pelagians, through which they ſuffer many thouſand poore ſoules to periſh, which can not helpe them ſelues, while they promiſe them both life euerlaſting, and the kingdome of heauen without baptiſme, whereas the Pelagians promiſed life euerlaſting only.* Who would thinke, that this ſlaunderous heretique had liued ſo long in England as hee did before he became fugitiue, which lyeth ſo impudētly without all colour or ſhewe of trueth? Was there euer any of vs heard to preach of baptiſme, as not neceſſarie for infāts, if they might obteine it according to the inſtitution of Chriſt?

Christ. But contrariwise, that it is a cruell errour of the Papists, which condēneth infants, who being preuented by death, can not obteyne the outward Sacrament: yet hath this error Augustine and Cypriane to vpholde it. But if Augustine and Cypriane neuer erred, no not about the doctrine of the Sacramentes, then let their authoritie defend the Papists. But when Cypriane denyed the Baptisme of Heretikes to be any thing auayleable, how many thousand soules both of yong and olde dyd he condemne? And whē Augustine with Pope Innocent holdeth the communion to be as necessarie for the saluation of Infants as Baptisme: how many hūdred thousand soules doth he condemne, or the Papistes destroy, which denye the communiō vnto them? Cyprian lib. 1. Epi. 6. Magno. Augustin. *Contra duas Epist. Pelagi. lib. 2. Cap. 4.* where he accuseth the Pelagians, as well for affirming the Communion not to be necessarie for Infants, as for houlding, that Baptisme was not needefull for them.

In the 38. Demaunde he chargeth vs with denying prescript fasting dayes, which is false, when they be prescribed by the Churche of God, and not vsurped of superstition and opinion of merite.

He chargeth vs further with denying of Free Will, and quoteth in the margent August. Tom. 6. *De fide cōtra Manichæos, Cap. 9 & 10.* where in deede Augustine against the Manichees affirmeth the Free Will of man, but in his retractations he sheweth, that euen then hee vnderstoode it of the state of Man before his fall, and therefore the Pelagians, whiche were maynteyners of Free Will to remayne in man since the fall of Adam, did slaunderously vsurp those his sayings against him and the truth, euen as the Papists do now. *Cum autem de libera voluntate rectè faciendi loquimur, de illa scilicet in qua homo factus est loquimur. Ecce tam longè antequam Pelagiana hæresis existisset sic disputauimus: velut iam contra illos disputaremus.* Whensoeuer we speake of the Free Will of man to do well, we speake of that Will, in whiche Man was made.

Behold ſo long before the Pelagian hereſie aroſe, we haue diſputed euē ſo,as though we had diſputed againſt them.*Retract. lib.* 1.*cap.*9.Now iudge whether if Papiſtes or we, be more like to the Pelagians. He chargeth vs moreouer,to hold againſt the merite of ſingle life, quoting *Aug.hær.*82.with Iouinian,which is falſe, for as Auguſtine vnderſtandeth by merite worthines or excellency, we acknowledge that the ſtate of virginitie is more excellent then of matrimony, in ſuch reſpects as the Apoſtle preferreth it.1.Cor.7.

Laſt of all he chargeth vs, with holding againſt the vowe of ſingle life,quoting *Aug.Retract.lib.*2.*c.*22.where there is no word of any vowe,and much leſſe of vowing a ſingle life,in them that can not liue an honeſt & chaſt life without mariage. There is mention of certaine ſanctimoniales holy and deuout women,of whoſe chaſtity was no ſuſpition,which leauing their purpoſe of virginitie,were perſwaded by Iouinian to marie.Not we therefore,haue reuiued any old hereſie, but the Papiſts haue continued many old errors, reuiued many old hereſies, of the Phariſes,Pelagians, Anthropomorphites, & added many new of their owne, ſuch as were neuer heard of in the primitiue Church,for ſix hundred yeares after Chriſt,as hath often bene ſhewed at large.

The 4. *and* 5. *motiues are included in the* 10. *demaund.*

Miracles dogmaticall,a marke of true doctrine for the ſacrifice of the Maſſe, for purgatory. Deuills expelled with a Maſſe by a Prieſt of S. Auguſtines, who was of our religion. S.Bede of our religion. Maſſe ſayd for the dead often times to redemption both of body and ſoule. The ſacrament of the altare ſticked by the Iewes bleedeth. Monkes and monaſteries. Viſions for our religion. An Engliſhe woman miraculouſly cured of late by the bleſſed ſacrament. Holy water. Maſſe confirmed by miracles in Afrike, Englande and Brabant. Briſtow.

Fulke.

Bristow diuideth miracles into dogmaticall and personall. Of the first sort he setteth this conclusion. *Whosoeuer haue at any time set them selues against any doctrine confirmed by miracle, they haue bene against the truth. There can to this no instans be giuen: our doctrine which they resist hath bene confirmed by miracles, therefore plaine it is that they are enemies of the truth.*

Doe you heare this shameles beast, say, there can be no instans giuen against his proposition? When ỹ Lord him selfe giueth an expresse law, against a false prophet, which sheweth signes or miracles. *Deut.* 13. Did not Iannes and Iambres wh ch resisted moses, worke miracles: doth not our Sauiour Christ prophecy that many false christes and false prophets should arise and worke such great signes and miracles, as (if it were possible, the very elect should be deceiued. *Matth.* 24. Doth not S. Paule prophecy, that the comming of Antichrist shalbe according to the working of Satan, in all power and lying signes and miracles, and therefore no maruel if Bristow bragge, that he can fill whole volumes with them? But miracles are not the triall, but the confirmation of doctrine, which must be tried onely by the Scriptures of God: without the authoritie wherof, no miracles ought to moue vs to giue credit, and much lesse any miracles may moue vs to beleue any doctrine which is against it. But yet let vs consider of such miracles as Bristow rehearseth.

First for the sacrifice of the Masse, and for purgatory. *August. de ciuit. Dei lib.* 22. *cap.* 8. writeth, that in a Ferme house of one Hesperius, was great hurt and trouble by euill spirits, which at the prayers of a certaine Priest or elder of Augustines Church, was staied & ceased. There is no word of deuills expelled with a Masse, or with the sacrifice of ỹ Masse. That which in Bristowes eare soundeth that way, is *Perrexit vnus*, &c. One went thether, " he offered there the sacrifice of the body of Christ, praying with all his power, that the same vexation might " ceasse: But Augustine by offring the sacrifice of Christes body,

body, meaneth nothing, but miniſtring of the communion, as that holy action was then figuratiuely called, but yet nether the Maſſe, nor the ſacrifice thereof, was at that time inuented, as I haue often & plentifully ſhewed els where, and namely againſt *Heſkins lib. 3. cap. 22.* That he nameth the ſacrifice of the body of Chriſt, it is not ſufficient to proue him of Briſtowes religion, greater cauſe haue we to chalenge him to be of our religion, when he calleth the ſacrament the ſigne of the body of Chriſt, and ſayth, that Chriſt will not giue vs that body which was borne of the virgine, and crucified &c. *contra Adimant. In Ioann. tract. 40 cap. 12.*

From Auguſtine he paſſeth to a tale reported in Bedes hiſtorie of a captiue, whoſe chaines were looſed at ſuch time, as his brother which was a Monke and Prieſt ſayd maſſe for him, by which reporte, Bede ſayth, many were moued to pray, giue almes or offer the ſacrifice of the holy oblation for the deliuerie of their frendes which were departed out of this world. a ſorie motiue without the autoritie of Gods word, which albeit it was credited of Bede, as diuerſe other fables were, yet may we doubt of the truth of it, and although it were true that ſuch a feate was wrought, yet it can not eſtabliſh a doctrine contrarie to the holy Scriptures. And notwithſtanding that Bede liuing in a corrupt time, holdeth many errors of Papiſtrie, yet I haue ſhewed againſt Stapletons fortreſſe, that he holdeth not all, nor many of the chiefeſt.

After this miracle of Bede, he beginneth the ſtorie of our countrye woman, which hauinge plaied the harlot in London, and running ouer into Flanders to ſeeke the knaue that got her with childe, was made lame with childbearing, ſo that one legge was ſhorter then an other by more then halfe a foote, ſayth Briſtow. But after often ſhrift, and other holy exerciſes of Poperie, in time of a maſſe, ſhe was reſtored to health by the ſacrament of miracle. I doubt not but the maſters of Bridewell (neere which place ſhe dwelled ſometime) which haue done as great cures as that, coulde haue healed her of

her lamenes, without the ſacrament of miracle. In rehearſall of this doggetricke miracle, he interlaceth an other as monſtruous a lye as this. That the pixe being ſtollen by a Iew, & the cakes ſticked in deſpight among the Iewes, did bleede aboundantly, that a druncken woman a Iew borne, and chriſtned, being admoniſhed by an Angell in a viſion, reſtored that pixe with three hoſtes in it to her goſtly father, from whom they were tranſlated to S. Gudulaes church in Bruxells, where they are kept vntill this day, from the yere of our Lord 1369. which is moe then 200. yeares agoe. The like fable they haue at the Monaſterie of Billets in Paris, where they haue a cruſe full of the miraculous blood, which iſſued out of the maſſe cake ſo ſticked by the Iewes: which are euen as great miracles, as the blood of Hailes was in England. For if the Papiſts durſt for their credit, cõmit thoſe miraculous hoſtes and blood vnto indifferent vewe and cuſtodie, where no fraude might be vſed, I durſt aduenture my life, (which is almoſt all that I haue to leeſe) that within leſſe then two yeares, they ſhall either be founde to conſiſt of a counterfait matter that is perdurable, or els they ſhall putrefie and rotte; which they woulde beare vs in hande, haue continued more then two hundreth yeares: In the demaund and in the next motiue métiõ is made of miracles wrought in India and by Pius quintus the Pope at Rome which either are lyes, or iugglingcaſts of counterfeating coſeners. But if they or their Pope haue any ſuch power, as they bragge of, why come they not in the face of their aduerſaries, & challenge them, as Helias did the Prieſts of Baal, and in open ſight of their enemies ſhewe their mightie miracles: and not prate of wonders done in the Indes, of which they may lye, where there is none to controlle them, or wrought, among them ſelues, where we can iudge nothing of them, but counterfeating and coſening, with which practiſes they haue bene taken & tried too often, to gaine any credit with any that haue any wiſedom in them.

The

The 6. motiue.

Miracles perſonall, a marke of true Doctors. S. Barnarde of our religion with what miracles he confirmed images, churches, the reall preſence, tranſubſtantiation, ſacrifice of the maſſe, praying for the dead, praying to Sainctes, and many other articles. Miracles for & by holy bread & for the ſigne of the croſſe. The ſigne of the croſſe worketh miracles. Excommunication of Pius v to be feared, who by his prayers & ſigning of the croſſe, did caſt deuills out of fiue women. Briſtow.

Briſtowes principle againſt which there can be no inſtance, is this. *VVhatſoeuer perſons at any time ſince Chriſtes aſcention haue had the grace of miracles, they were the miniſters of Chriſt, I ſay not alwayes iuſt and holy: but alwayes preachers of his truth: and conſequently, whoſoeuer ſet themſelues againſt ſuch perſons they were againſt Chriſt & againſt the truth.* In the laſt chapter before, I haue brought inſtance, both out of the Law and the Goſpell, of falſe Prophets and falſe Chriſtes, which ſhould worke great miracles, and yet preach againſt God & Chriſt. Wherefore this concluſion is vtterly falſe. Fulke.

Briſtow replieth, they are lying ſignes, ſuch as were wrought by Iannes and Iambres, and ſhalbe wrought by Antichriſt, not able to abide the triall, ſo ſay I of all Popiſh miracles, either they are fayned, or els they are counterfaited, or if any wonderous thing be done, it is according to the working of Satan as the Apoſtle teacheth vs. 2. *Theſſ.* 2. So did Marcus the hereticke make ſtraunge appearaunces in the ſacrement of Chriſtes blood, as witneſſeth *Irenæus lib.* 1. *cap.* 9. Tertullian affirmeth, the holy Ghoſt the comforter to be in the Mõtaniſtes, by acknowledging of the promiſed graces *lib de anima cap. de inferis.* Where alſo he maketh mention of prayer for the dead confirmed by a miracle among the Montaniſts. Auguſtine ſpeaketh of Paulus & Donatus, that wrought miracles to confirme the hereſie of the Donatiſtes. *de vnitat. eccleſ. Sozomenus lib.* 1. *cap.* 14 repor-

teth that Eutychianus a Nouatian heretike, was notable in working of miracles. Wherfore if the fables written of Fraunceis, Dominike, Becket, &c. were true, yet are not they by such miracles proued true preachers.

But S. Bernard was of our religion sayth Bristow. In deede he maintained many of your opinions, yet not all nor the chiefest, for he beleued that a man might be saued *sola fide* by faith only *Ep.77.* But he was an enemy to the Henricians which burned images, destroyed Churches and were against all such pointes of Poperie, as the title mentioneth: and these heretikes he ouercame, not only by preaching, but by miracles (sayth Bristow) as he testifieth himselfe *Ep.241.* The truth (saith he) *was made manifest non solum in sermone sed etiam in virtute: not only by preaching but also by working* as doth Bristow translate, wheras he should say, not only by speech but also by power, so that of miracle there is no mentiō. Yet Godfrie the Monke, that was his disciscipie, writteth of miracles wrought by breade, sanctified with the signe of the crosse. &c: But Godfries writing we holde for no Gospell. Neither know we the contrarie, but some Godfrie Gods foe, which liued long after Bernarde, might fayne those bookes in the name of one of his disciples that liued in his time, for the number of miracles rehearsed in them, farre passe the number of the miracles recorded by the Euangelists of our Sauiour Christ. And that you may know from what spirite those bookes proceeded, you shall vnderstand, that the same *Godfrie lib. 1. cap. 3.* extolleth the wisedom of Barnard aboue all the

" Scriptures. *Vtebatur sanè Scripturis tam liberè commodè q;*
" *vt non tam sequi illas quam præcedere crederetur, & ducere*
" *ipse quò vellet, auctorem earum ducem spiritum sequens.* He
" vsed in deede the Scriptures so freely and fitly that he
" might be thought not so much to follow them, as to go
" before them, & to lead them whither he would, follow-
" ing the spirite, the autor of them as a guide. Againe he sayth of him. *Nam & confessus est aliquando sibi meditanti vel orāti, sacram omnem velut sub se positam & expositam*

apparuisse

apparuiſſe Scripturam. For he confeſſed ſometimes while he ſtudied or prayed, that all the holy Scripture appeared to him, as placed vnder him and expounded. But Bernard him ſelfe as appeareth by his wrytings, abhorred from that blaſphemous confeſſion: Againe thoſe epitaphes, which were written at his buriall, commende Bernard highly for his learning and vertue, but of miracles they ſpeake not, which they would not haue omitted, if they had bene ſo many as this Godfrie writeth.

The excommunication of Pius quintus, we feare no more then we beleue his miracle, howe ſoeuer that pageant was deuiſed, which cõmeth too late to perſwade vs, that the Pope can worke miracles. For it had bene more in ſeaſon for Leo the 10, or Clemens the ſeuenth, if they or any of theſe had receaued ſuch power, to haue ſhewed it in generall councell, or aſſembly of the ſtates againſt Luther and his followers, then now that Antichriſt is in ſo great part conſumed by the ſpirite of the Lords mouth, to thinke to eſtabliſh his throne by lying ſignes and wonders which fewe of the Papiſtes doe in their conſciences thinke to be other then counterfaited and forged.

The 8. *motiue is the* 12. *demaund.*

Viſions a marke of true doctrine and Doctors. Chriſt to be beleued for viſions. S. Auguſtine was of our religion and brought thereto by God. Beleuing the reall preſens of Chriſt in the ſacrament of the altare which is to be worſhipped with religion, ſaying maſſe for the dead. Prayer for the dead vſed alwayes. S. Gregory was of our religion. Maſſe ſayd euery day. Prayer for the dead cõfirmed by a viſion ſeruing for our religion, prophecies for our religion. VVhy Proteſtants deny not all the Scriptures. Viſions for our religion. The communion booke burned in a viſion. The communion in a viſion receaued by a blacke dogge. The ſeruice of Proteſtantes to be refrained. S. Cyprian of our religion. Brifiow.

Fulke. Of visions we haue the same rule, that of miracles such as are of God, serue to cõfirme that doctrine which is deliuered in the holy Scriptures. such were the visions shewed vnto the Apostles and holy men. But if any vision seemed to bringe in any doctrine that was not conteyned in the Scriptures, both the vision was to be knowen for a deuilish illusion, and the dreamer of that vision commaunded to be slayne. But how will Bristow proue, that S. Augustine was of his religion? euen by that wise argument, that he vseth so often, because he held some one error common with them, although he were contrary to them in the whole substance of religion. For thus he reasoneth. S. Augustine was of the same religion that his mother Monica was, who saw in a vision that he should be conuerted to the Catholike faith when he was a Manichee: But Monica was of our religion, *because she beleued the reall presence, and worshipped so that blessed sacrament with religion, and making of it God him selfe.*

But how proueth he that she so beleued and worshipped? *She knew* (sayth he) *that from the altar was ministred & dispensed* victima sancta &c. *that holy sacrifice wher by was stricken out that hand writing that was against vs. Aug. lib. cont. 9. cap.* 13. A straunge conclusion. She acknowledged the ministration of the sacrament to be a dispensation or communication of the sacrifice of Christs death, which euery Protestant doth, therefore she beleued the reall presence. But how did she worship the sacrament, and make God him selfe of it? Mary (S. Augustine sayth) Ad vnum &c. *To the sacramẽt of which our price, thy handmayde tyed her soule with the bonde of faith.* What word is here of worshipping, or making the sacrament God him selfe? Yes sayth Bristow: for Augustine sayth in other places, we must tye our soules to God alone, whereof religion is so named, wherefore she tying her soule to the sactament, maketh the sacrament God him selfe. A substantiall reason I promise you, by which you may as wel proue that she worshipped baptisme and made God him

him ſelfe of it, for there is no doubt, but vnto baptiſme (which is alſo the ſacrament of our pryce) ſhe tyed her ſoule with the bande of faith, and ſo hath euery faithfull Proteſtant. For the ſacraments by faith, are certaine pledges of our coniunction with God through Chriſt. Into whoſe death we are ingraffed by baptiſme, as we are fedde with his body and blood in the ſupper.

The place of Auguſtine is corruptly cited by Briſtow, who hath cut of both the head and the foote of it, which is this. *Ad vnum Deum tendentes, & ei vni religantes animas noſtras, vnde religio dicta creditur, omni ſuperſtitione careamus.* Hauing reſpect to one God and tying our ſoules to him onely, whereof religion is thought to be called, let vs be voyde of all ſuperſtition. For Monica had reſpect onely to God, when ſhe tyed her ſoule by faith vnto the ſeale of Gods promiſes. And ſhe was voyde of ſuperſtition, when ſhe cleaued to none other ceremonye of coniuncton with God, but onely to that, which was ordeyned of God him ſelfe for that purpoſe. But howe proueth Briſtow, that prayer for the deade was vſed alway, or that Maſſe was ſayd for the deade. Becauſe that in the corrupt tyme of Auguſtine, prayer was vſed for the deade, and in the prayers vſed at the celebration of the communion, remembraunce was made of the dead. This is a ſtraũge kind of reaſoning: that was vſed ſometime, therefore it was vſed alwayes. But how long it was vſed, and how it was taken vp, I haue ſhewed in myne aunſwer to Allins booke of Purgatory.

Now commeth S. Gregory to be of Briſtowes religion. I will not deny but in many errors and ſuperſtitions Gregory agreeth with the Papiſtes, but yet not in all, nor in ſome of the chiefeſt. The viſions he rehearſeth for prayer for ỹ dead, if they were not fayned dreames, they were illuſiõs of ỹ deuil, becauſe they ſerue to maintaine that doctrine, which is contrary to the Scriptures, which teach that after death followeth iudgement immediatly, ſo that no prayers can preuaile. *Heb.* 9.26. But prophecyes are for Briſtowes religion. How ſo I praye

you? The conuerſion of Auguſtine and the death of Caſſius were foretold in viſion. If both thoſe were graũted to be true viſions, your religion were neuer the better, except the conuerſion of the one, and the death of the other be your religion. But admitting the dreame of Monica to be a true viſion, howe proue you that the Chapeline of Caſſius did not fayne his viſion after his maiſter was dead?

But the dreame of Iudas Machabæus who ſawe the Prophet Ieremy pray for the people, is recorded in the Canonical Scripture it ſelfe (ſayth Briſtow) 2. *Mach.* 15. *chap.* which Scripture the Proteſtants reiect, becauſe it maketh againſt them, as they would doe all the reſt, but that they thinke they haue inuẽted ſhiftes good enough to blinde the worlde. What reuerence we beare to the holy Scriptures of God, he him ſelfe, our owne conſcience, and the whole world can teſtifie. And the reiection of ſuch bookes as were not written by the ſpirite of God, doth approue the ſame. Beſide the authoritie of the auncient Churche, both of the Iewes and Gentills which neuer receiued the ſame bookes into the canon, we haue often made manifeſt demonſtration, that they proceeded not from the ſpirite of God. Wherefore the Papiſtes making them of equall credit with the worde of God, incurre the curſe of God, which is vnto all them that either adde or take away any thing from his holy word.

But the Papiſtes are not deſtitute of viſions in theſe daies, for Briſtow knoweth a Proteſtant who hath confeſſed that he ſaw in a dreame, the communion booke out of many handes caſt into a fire, and yet the man cõtinueth a Proteſtant. Verely he doth as a good Chriſtian ſhould doe, that not onely with no vaine dreames, but nether with viſions of Angells from heauen he will be moued to condemne that doctrine which he knoweth aſſuredly to be agreable to the holy Scriptures. But there was a Papiſt in London, which came to ỹ Church againſt his conſcience, and ſawe a fowle blacke dogge

take

take the communion euer more, at the naughty miniſters hands, as he offred it to the communicants, which ſtroke the Papiſt ſo at the hart, that he went home and dyed vpon it. This deuiliſh illuſion, or melãcholike perſwaſion of a deuiliſh dogged Papiſt, thinketh Briſtow able to condemne the holy miniſtration of the Lordes ſupper, warranted by ỹ Scriptures according to Chriſtes inſtitution? As for the extaticall & fantaſticall dreame of maiſter Allington, tending (as I remember) to mainteine Idolatrie, wiſe men regard as much as ſuch fantaſies deſerue, after which, if we ſhould ſhape our religion, we ſhoulde alter as often as any mans fonde humor or fooliſh conceit miniſtreth newe viſions and ſtraunge apparitions. But I maruell amonge ſo many viſions, that Briſtow omitteth, the famous viſion of Elizeus Hall that came from Mancheſter to London, with a booke of his cold prophecyes, to cõuert the Queene & the Realme to Papiſtrie. Well (ſayth Briſtow) you ſcorne at our viſions and dreames, yet was S. Cyprian of our religion: Becauſe he defendeth ſome viſions and dreames which were ſeene in his time, which were not to mainteyne any thing cõtrary to the Scripture, but that which was agreable to the ſame. A poore reaſon, why he ſhould be of your religion. And yet it is all the reaſon that you bringe. But for our iudgement of miracles, of viſions & dreames to be motiues in controuerſies of the Church, you ſhall heare Auguſtines ſentence, *De vnitate Eccleſiæ cap.* 16. againſt the Donatiſtes. *Remotis ergo omnibus talibus, Eccleſiam ſuam demonſtrent, ſi poſſunt, non in ſermonibus & rumoribus Aſrorum, non in concilijs Epiſcoporum ſuorum, non in literis quorumlibet d. ſputatorum, non in ſignis & prodigijs fallacibus, quia etiam contra iſta verbo Domini præparati & cauti redditi ſumus, ſed in præſcripto legis, in Prophetarum prædictis, in Pſalmorum cantibus, in ipſius paſtoris vocibus, in Euangeliſtarum prædicationibus & laboribus, hoc eſt in omnibus canonicis ſanctorum librorum auctoritatibus.* Wherefore ſetting aſide all ſuch matters, let them ſhew forth the Church to be theirs, if they can, not in the

« ſpeaches and rumors of Africanes, not in the councells
« of their Biſhops, not in the writings of all maner of diſ-
« courſers, not in deceyueable ſignes & wonders, becauſe
« that euen againſt thoſe thinges, we are prepated and
« made warye by the worde of our Lorde: but in the pre-
« ſcript of the lawe, in the predictions of the Prophets, in
« the ſonges of the Pſalmes, in the voyces of the ſheepe-
« herd him ſelfe, in the preachings and labors of the E-
« uangeliſtes, that is to ſay in all the canonicall authori-
« ties of the holy bookes 3. And againe in the ſame chap-
« ter, *& ſic oſtendat & non dicat, verum eſt quia ego hoc dico,*
« *aut quia hoc dixit ille collega meus, aut illi collegæ mei, aut*
« *illi Epiſcopi vel Clerici, vel Laici noſtri, aut ideò verum eſt*
« *quia illa & illa mirabilia fecit Donatus, vel Pontius, aut*
« *quilibet alius, aut quia homines ad memorias mortuorum no-*
« *ſtrorum orant & exaudiuntur, aut quia illa & illa ibi contin-*
« *gunt, aut quia ille frater noſter, aut illa ſoror noſtra, tale viſum*
« *vigilans vidit, vel tale viſum dormiens ſomniauit. Remoue-*
« *antur iſta vel figmenta mendacium hominum, vel portenta*
« *fallacium ſpirituum, aut enim non ſunt vera, quæ dicuntur, aut*
« *ſi hæreticorum aliqua mira facta ſunt, magis cauere debemus.*
« And let him ſo ſhew it, that he ſay not, it is true becauſe
« I ſay this, or becauſe this ſayd that companion of mine,
« or thoſe companions of mine, or thoſe our Biſhops or
« Clerkes or laymen: or therefore it is true, becauſe Do-
« natus or Pontius or any other hath done theſe or thoſe
« miracles, or becauſe men pray at the memories of our
« martyrs & are hearde, or becauſe theſe are thoſe things
« doe happen there, or becauſe that our brother or that
« ou rſiſter ſawe ſuch a viſion waking, or dreamed ſuch a
« viſion ſleping. Let theſe things be remoued which ether
« are the faynings of lying men, or els the wonders of de-
« ceyuing ſpirites, for either they are not true that are
« ſayd to be, or if any miracles are done by heretikes, we
« ought the more to take heede of them. And yet againe
« he writeth in the ſame booke and chapter. *Sed verum ipſi*
« *eccleſiam teneant, non niſi diuinarum ſcripturarum Canonicis*
« *libris oſtendant, quia nec nos propterea dicimus nobis crede-*

re

re oportere, quod in ecclesia Christi sumus, quia ipsam quam te- »
nemus commendauit Mileuitanus Optatus, vel Mediolanen- »
sis Ambrosius, vel alij innumerabiles nostræ cõmunionis Epi- »
scopi, aut quia nostrorum collegarum concilijs ipsa predicata »
est, aut quia per totum orbem in locis sanctis quæ frequentat »
nostra communio tanta mirabilia, vel exauditionum vel sa- »
nitatum fiunt, ita vt latentia per tot annos corpora martyrum »
(quod possunt à multis interrogantes audire) Ambrosio fuerint »
reuelata, & ad ipsa corpora Cæcus multorum annorum, ciui- »
tati Mediolanensi notissimus oculos lumẽq; receperit, aut quia »
ille Sõnium vidit, & ille spiritu assumptus audiuit, siue ne in- »
iret in partem Donati, siue vt recederet à parte Donati. Quæ, »
cunq; talia in Catholica fiunt, ideo sunt approbãda, quia in Ca- »
tholica fiunt: non ideo ipsa manifestatur Catholica quia hæc »
in ea fiunt. Ipse Dominus Iesus cum resurrexisset à mortuis, »
& discipulorum oculis videndum manibusq; tangendum cor- »
pus suum offerret: nequid tamen fallaciæ se pati arbitrarentur, »
magis eos testimonijs Legis & Prophetarum & Psal- »
morum confirmandos esse iudicauit ostendens, ea de se imple- »
ta, quæ fuerant tanto ante prædicta. Sic & ecclesiam suam cõ- »
mendauit dicens prædicari in nomine suo pœnitentiam & re- »
missionem peccatorum per omnes gentes, incipientibus ab »
Hierusalem. Hoc in Lege & Prophetis & Psalmis esse scri- »
ptum ipse testatus est, hoc eius ore commendatum tenemus. »
Hæc sunt causæ nostræ documenta, hæc fundamenta, hæc fir- »
mamẽta. But whether they holde the church or no, let »
them shew none otherwise, but by the Canonical bookes »
of the holy Scriptures: Because that neither we do say, »
that therefore men must beleue vs, that we are in the »
Church of Christ, because Optatus of Mileuitum or »
Ambrose of Millain, or innumerable other Bishops of »
our communion, haue commended this Church which »
we hold, or because it is commaunded in the councels »
of our fellow Bishops, or because that in the holy places »
which our comunion doth frequent throughout the »
worlde, so great miracles are done either of hearing »
mens prayers or of healings, so that the bodies of mar- »
tyrs which haue bene hidden for so many yeres, (which »

« which thing if they will aſke they may heare of many)
« were reuealed vnto Ambroſe, and that at the ſame bo-
« dies a man which had bene blind many yeres, very well
« knowen to the city of Millain, receiued his eyes & ſight:
« or becauſe this man ſawe a dreame, or that man being
« taken vp in ſpirite did heare, either that he ſhoulde not
« enter into the faction of Donatus, or that he ſhould de-
« part from Donatus ſide. Whatſoeuer of ſuch things are
« done in the Catholike church, they are therefore to
« be approued becauſe they are done in the Catholike
« church, but the church is not therby proued Catholike,
« becauſe ſuch things are done in it. Our lord Ieſus him-
« ſelfe, when he had riſen from the dead, & offred his bo-
« dy to be ſeene with the eyes, & touched with the hands
« of his diſciples, yet leaſt they ſhould think they ſuffered
« any illuſion, he iudged that they were rather to be con-
« firmed with the teſtimonies of the lawe & the prophets,
« & the Pſalmes, ſhewing that thoſe thinges were fulfilled
« of him, which were ſo long before prophecied. So alſo
« he cõmended his church, ſaying, that repentance & for-
« genenes of ſinnes muſt be preached in his name throgh
« out all nations, beginning at Hieruſalem. This he him
« ſelfe teſtifieth to be writtẽ in the lawe & the prophetes,
« & the pſalmes, this we holde being commaunded to it
« by his owne mouth. Theſe be proſes of our cauſe, theſe
« be our foundations, & theſe be our ſtrong argumentes.

Theſe thinges I haue ſet downe more at large, out of Auguſtine, becauſe they are not onely a ſtop vnto theſe motiues of miracles, & viſions, but in a manner to all the reſt that followe.

The 8. motiue is the 4. demaunde.

Briffow. *Scriptures denied by the Proteſtantes, what ſcriptures they deny, praying for the dead confirmed by ſcripture, & pray or of ſaintes for vs, fayth onely againſt the ſcripture. Reall preſence of Chriſt in the ſacrament confirmed by ſcripture. No ſcripture,*

sure is against the Catholikes but all is for them.

WHosoeuer haue taught doctrine (saith Bristow) *so plainly repugnant to the holy Scriptures, that for maintenaunce thereof they were faine to deny bookes of the holy Scriptures, or to say the Scriptures to haue bene falsified and corrupted, they were heretikes: and such are the Protestantes, therefore they are heretikes:* Howe proue you the Protestants to be suche? Marie sayth Bristow first they deny the Canonicall most certayne Scripture of the Machabees, for none other cause, but that it is playne against their heresies, maynteyning prayer for the dead and prayer of Sainctes for vs. This is a lowde lye, for we shewe many causes, why we reiect that prophane writing of Iasons abridger, beside the auctoritie of the Iewish church before Christ, and the primitiue church after Christ as I haue declared against the secõd booke of Allens defence cap. 3. But in defense of the booke of Machabees to be Canonical, Bristow wil say as S. Augustine sayd to certeyne that denyed a testimony of the booke of wisedom *de prædest. Non debuit. They should not reiect the saying of the booke of wisedom which in the church of Christ hath deserued so long a rew of yeares to be recited in the steppe of the readers of the church of Christ and with worship of diuine auctoritie to be heard of all Christians from the Bishops to the lowest sorte of lay men &c.* And againe. *Et Etiam temporibus &c. Euen the notable interpreters that were next to the Apostles times, when they brought forth that booke for witnes, beleued that they brought nothing but a diuine testimonie.* Fulke.

Touching this defense, first I aske of Bristow, how he can proue that the booke of Machabees, hath had such continuaunce of credit? Secondly howe this saying of Augustine cõcerning the booke of wisedom, can be true when Hierome plainly reiecteth it, as not Canonicall *præfat. in Prouerb.* Thirdly I demaunde how Bristow can defend his maior, if we admitte this saying of Augustine to be true, for not Pelagius as Allen sayth expressely,

nor any Pelagians as Bristow seemeth to meane, but such as defended the Catholike faith against Pelagius, reiected this saying of the booke of Wisedome, which booke also we refuse, although not for that saying. and what one article of our doctrine doth that booke impugne? nay rather there is testimonies therein manifest against Images, against Purgatory and merites, yet can not we therefore allow the writings of Philo a Iew since Christes time, for the canonicall Scripture of Salomon, whose title it falsly beareth.

But to proceede, *Luther denyeth the Epistle of S. Iames, because it is against his heresie of iustification by faith onely.* We allowe not Luther, neither did he allow him self therein, for he retracteth it afterward. Yet is not Eusebius counted an heretike which vtterly reiecteth that Epistle. *Lib. 2. cap. 23.*

But to goe on, *Beza doth say, that S. Lukes Gospell is falsified, because it mainteyneth the reall presence of Christ in the sacramẽt, where he sayth,* Hic est calix *this is the chalice, which is shed for you.* This is an impudent slaunder, which I haue aunswered against Saũders rocke of the church, in his ninthe marke of an Antichristiã, where it is handled at large, and thether I referre the Reader. To conclude, Bristow saith, no Scriptures is against the Catholikes but all for them, because they must obediently receiue and beleue all Scriptures canonicall. But what obedience and beliefe they attribute to the canonicall Scriptures, it is plaine by this, that they dare not abide the triall by them, but flie from them to traditions as Bristow doth euen in the next motiue, as though the Scriptures inspired of God were not sufficient both to teache all truth, and to confute all errors.

In the demaund this motiue is handled somewhat otherwise, for there we are examined, whether in the cõference of Carthage Augustine and his fellowes did not proue by Scripture, that a visible Church should beginne at Hierusalem which shoulde continue visibly to the ende of the world. I aunswer, they proued sufficient-

ly

ly, that the preaching of the gospell beginning at Hierusalem, should gather the Church out of all partes of the world, and therefore the faction of Donatus, which begonne in Africa & was not to be found but in a corner of Africa, could not be the Church of Christ. But of a visible Church to continue visibly in manner as Bristow demaundeth, there was no controuersie in that conference, and therefore no proofe thereof brought out of the Scriptures.

The 9. motiue is the 29 demaund.

Traditions most certaine. The Apostles were of our religion. S. Augustine, S. Chrysostome, S. Hierome, S. Cypriane. fasting daies, lent, masse for the dead prayer for the dead confirmed by the Apostles traditions, water mingling mith the wine in the chalice. The Masse made by S. Paule. S. Paule of our religiō. Bristow.

The true Church (sayth Bristow) *hath alwayes had traditions beside the Scripture, and what company soeuer was faine to crye for only Scriptures, & to deny most certeyne traditions of the Apostles, their doctrine was heresie and they heretikes.* Fulke.
To proue that the church had alwayes traditions beside Scripture, he bringeth in the sayings of S. Paule 1. *Cor.* 11. 2. *Thess.* 3. before the Scripture was all written, when it was necessary for the Church to haue much of the doctrine deliuered onely by preaching, yet had they no doctrine of faith, but such as was cōfirmed by scriptures of the olde testament, as is manifest 2. *Pet.* 1, But for the certaintye of popishe traditions, what proofe hath he? First Basil *de sp. sancto cap.* 27. sayth *Dogmata &c.* Matters of doctrine which are kept and preached in the church, we haue partly by doctrine committed to writing, partly by tradition of the Apostles, which are of like force vnto godlines &c. But the same Basil writeth contrary to him selfe and agreeable to the truth, ἠθικ π παν τὸ ὀκτος τῆς θεοπνεύστου γραφῆς οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως ὂν αμαρτία

157. Whatsoeuer is beside the holy Scripture, in that it is not of faith, is sinne. And ἐν οἷς καὶ ἐπιλ. συν. he requireth euen newe planted Christians to be instructed in the holy Scriptures, both for their full perswasiō in godlines, & also ὑπὲρ τοῦ μὴ προσθισθήναι ἀνθρωπίναις παραδόσεσιν. that they be not acquainted with mens traditions. Furthermore (sayth Bristow) Augustine, Epiphanius & the Protestants them selues, condemne Heluidius for an heretike, for denying the perpetuall virginitie of Marye the mother of Christ, contrary to the Churches tradition. Nay rather for troubling ỹ church with contention about that, in which he hath no groūd out of the Scriptures. Now let vs see how they are proued to be heretikes, that refuse traditions of the Apostles, & are fayne to cry for onely Scriptures. First that Maximinus the Arrian did so, ergo whosoeuer doth so is an heretike, according to Bristowes logike. And yet he belyeth Maximinus, for he refused not traditions of the Apostles, but such wordes as were beside the Scripture, meaning *Homousion* & such like termes, which were thē newly vsed, but yet conteyned no newe doctrine, but euen that which alwayes was approued according to the Scriptures. The same thing did the decree of the heretical Emperour Constantius forbid, & not traditions of the Apostles, of which was no controuersie, betwene the true Christians & the Arrians. But that the Scriptures onely are of sufficient authoritie to confute heresies, Augustine declareth euen against the same Maximinus

" *lib. 3. cap. 14. Sed nunc nec ego Nicenum &c.* But now must
" not I bring forth the councel of Nice, nor thou the coū-
" cel of Ariminum, to make any preiudice, but by the au-
" thoritie of Scriptures not being proper to ether, but cō-
" mon witnesses to vs both, let matter contend with mat-
" ter, cause with cause, reason with reason. Likewise he and
" his fellow Bishops sayd vnto the Donatists in the confe-
" rence of Carthage. *Si tantummodo id quæreretur quæ vel*
vbi esset Ecclesia, nihil se acturos publicis gestis, sed scriptura-

rum

non diuinarum tantummodo teſtimonijs. If this onely were » the queſtion, which or where the Church were, that » they woulde pleade nothing at all by publike actes of » men, but only by the teſtimonies of the holy Scriptures. »
Yet ſayth Briſtow, the Apoſtles were of our religion, becauſe Chryſoſtom ſayth *Ad pop. Antioch.* that it was decreed by the Apoſtles, that in the dreadfull myſteries a remẽbrance ſhould be made of the dead. This ſayth Briſtow, was maſſe for the dead. How prayers for the dead came in & how at lẽgth ſacrifice of the maſſe was applied vnto the dead, I haue ſhewed ſufficiently againſt Allen *lib. 2. ca. 5.* If we ſhould admit all thinges to be ordeyned of the Apoſtles, which ſome of the olde writers doe aſcribe to their traditions, wee ſhould receiue many thinges that euen the Papiſtes them ſelues doe not obſerue. As that it is a wicked thing to faſt on Sõday, or to pray kneling, that oblations are to be made for mens birth dayes, &c. which with diuerſe other ſuperſtitions Tertullian fathereth vpon the tradition of the Apoſtles, as wel as oblation for the dead. *De coron. mil.* hearing therfore ſuch manifeſt vntruths are fathered vpon the Apoſtles tradition by moſt aũcient writers, what certainty can we haue of their tradition, without their owne writing. Againe S. Hierom ſaith it was a tradition of the Apoſtles, to faſt 40 daies in the yeare. If this be true, then is the popiſh ſtory falſe, that maketh Teleſphorus Biſhop of Rome author of that lenten faſt. Euſebius ſheweth the great diuerſitie of faſting before Eaſter *li. 5, cap. 26.* ſaying that ſome faſted but 1 day, ſome 2 daies, ſome more, ſome 40 howres of day & night, this diuerſitie proueth ẏ Hierom vntruly aſcribeth ẏ tradition to the Apoſtles, which ſhould haue bene kept vniformely, if it had any inſtitution of the Apoſtles. Cyprian ſayth it was our Lordes tradition, that the wine in the communion ſhould be mingled ẅ water. But the Scripture ſaith not ſo, S. Paule ẅ deliuered that ẅ he receiued of Chriſt, ſaith not ſo. And yet Cypriã cõtẽdeth principally for the vſe of wine in the cup againſt the watry heretikes that vſed onely water. It is a cõmon

thinge with the auncient writers, to defend euery ceremony mhich was vſed in their time, by tradition of the Apoſtles. But the chiefe matter is *the maſſe*, which ſayth Briſtow *S. Paule one of our religion made*. I maruell whether Briſtow writeth this for fooles to beleue, or for wiſe men to laughe at. When they themſelues make Gregory or Scholaſticus, or I can not tell whom, auctor of the canon, and when they write howe euery peece was added by what Pope, what impudence is it to ſay, that S. Paule made the Maſſe, and to call Auguſtine to witneſſe that which he good man, did neuer thinke of, and much leſſe write. Whoſe wordes Briſtow hath mangled and falſified. for thus he citeth them *Ep. 118. cap 6. Totum illum agendi ordinem, quem vniuerſum per orbem ſeruat Eccleſia, ab ipſo ordinatum eſſe*. That by him was ordeyned this order of doing, which through the whole world the Church doth keepe in doing of Maſſe. The wordes of Auguſtine ſpeaking of receiuing the communion, faſting, or before all other meates, are theſe, vpon the wordes of S. Paule. *Cætera cum venero ordinabo. Vnde intelligi datur, quia multum erat vt in epiſtola totum illum agendi ordinem inſinuaret, quem vniuerſa per orbem ſeruat Eccleſia, ab ipſo ordinatum eſſe, quod nulla morum diuerſitate variatur.* Other thinges will I ſet in order when I come. Whereby it is giuen vs to be vnderſtood becauſe it was much, that in an epiſtle he ſhould ſet forth that whole order of doing, which the whole Church throughout the world doth obſerue, that this thinge was ordeyned by him, which is varied by no diuerſitie of maners, vnderſtanding the cuſtome of receyuing the communion faſting, which he ſayd before was generally obſerued in all places. But of ordeyning the maſſe there is no title. You ſee now howe ỹ Apoſtles & eſpecially S. Paule is of Briſtowes religion, beſide Chryſoſtō, Hierom & Cypriā.

The 10 *and* 11 *motiues are confuſely conteyned in the* 34 *demaund.*

Briſtow. *The Churches iudgement is alwayes infallible. When by*

Iewell

Iewell the Church of God dyed. Donatiſtes and Luciferians aliue againe in Proteſtants. S. Auguſtine and S. Hierome were of our religion. Proteſtants in their owne conſcience be againſt the Church which is euerlaſting and viſible. No ſcripture againſt the Catholiks but all for them. Chriſt to be loued for the authoritie of his Church, for which there be playner propheceyes then for Chriſt him ſelfe.

Although we ſhould graunt the Churches iudgemẽt to be alwaies infallible, yet would we neuer graunt the popiſh churches authoritye which falleth ſo manifeſtly from the word of God, & thereby ſheweth her ſelf to be the malignant Church, & Synagogue of Satan. That the Church of Chriſt hath alwaies ben from ỹ beginning, & ſhal continue vnto the end of the world, we all confeſſe and defende. Wherefore it is an impudent ſlaunder of Briſtow, to ſaye that *by Iewell the Church dyed within ſix hundreth yeares after Chriſt.* And that the Donatiſtes and Luciferians are reuiued in Proteſtants. For we nether ſay, that the Church is periſhed out of all places, except Africa, as the Donatiſtes, nor that it is become a ſtewes with the Luciferians. But the Papiſtes are more like to the Donatiſtes, which ſay the Church is periſhed out of all partes of the world except Europe, and in ſteede of the Church they defende a ſtewes and ſincke of al Idolatrie, ſuperſtition & vngodlines. Therefore Auguſtine and Hierom be not of Briſtowes religion, for condemning thoſe heretikes to whome Briſtow and his Papiſtes are more like then the Proteſtants. Fulke.

Nether doe Proteſtants in their conſcience thinke the Church of Chriſt to be againſt them, becauſe Caſtalio an Anabaptiſt tranſlateth *Eccleſiæ* the Churche into *reipublicæ* the common wealth, or becauſe many vſe the name of congregation, which is the true ſignification of this word *Eccleſia*, as no man will deny that is not paſt all ſhame. That the Churche is euerlaſting and viſible to them that haue ſuche eyes as the Churche is, that is ſpirituall, we neuer deny. But that it is viſible to the

world alwayes, that ſhall neuer be proued. That no Scripture is againſt the Catholikes we graunt, but that many Scriptures are againſt the Papiſts, it hath bene more then a thouſand times proued. That the church geueth teſtimonie to Chriſt & that the prophecies of the churches euerlaſting continuance are plaine & euident, It is no queſtion betwene vs. But that the ſynagoge of Romiſh Papiſts is the church of Chriſt, to whō ſuch credit or reuerence is to be geuen, that I ſay, if Briſtow woulde burſt for anger, againſt the Proteſtantes, he ſhall neuer be able to proue.

The 11. *motiue.*

Briſtow. *The practiſe or cuſtome of the church of God. S. Paule and S. Auguſtine of our religion. Exorciſme & exufflation in baptiſme. Pelagians aliue againe in Proteſtants. Baptiſme neceſſary for ſalnation of children. Chaūge of religion neuer made by vs. Altares & prayer for the dead vſed alwayes. Reall preſence of Chriſt in the Sacramēt. Pilgrimage reliques of Saints. S. Hierom of our religiō. Miracles for reliques. Churches cōfirmed by miracles. What an impudēt attēpt is chaūge of religiō.*

Of the churches practiſe & cuſtome I ſay, euen as of the churches iudgement, that how much ſoeuer it be to be eſteemed, yet is not the Popiſh church the Catholike church of Chriſt but an apoſtaſie & ſchiſme from it. Neither is it ſufficiēt for Briſtow to ſay, ỳ Popiſh church practiſeth many things that the aūciēt church of Chriſt practiſed, therfore it is the true church of Chriſt, except he can proue, that the Popiſh church teacheth & practiſeth all & nothing els but that which the anciēt church of Chriſt did teach & practiſe. In ſtede whereof Briſtow can allege nothing, but certeine ſpots & wrinkles of the elder church, which the Popiſh church doth embrace, hauing almoſt nothing els like vnto it. But let vs ſee how ſubſtantially he proueth out of S. Paule & S. Auguſtine, that the churches cuſtome and practiſe is an infallible rule of truth. Firſt S. Paule (ſaith he) 1. *Cor.* 11. after many reaſons

reasons for the vncomelines of womēs going bareheaded recoyleth to this inuincible forte. *Si quis &c.* But if any man seeme to be contentious: we haue no such custome (for women to pray vncouered) nor the church of God. See how this impudent asse, to stablish his ground of custome, is not ashamed to falsifie the wordes of holy Scripture. S. Paul saith, if any man seme to be desirous of contention, we haue no such custome, nor the churches of God, whereby he meaneth plainly, that it is not the custome of the Apostles, nor of the church of God, to be contentious about such small matters of external behauiour. May we herof inferre, that whatsoeuer the church at any time hath vsed, is allowable, & to be vsed alwaies? *S. Aug. Ep.* 118. *Ian.* is cited by Bristow but corruptly. *Si quid tota per orbē frequentat ecclesia hoc quia ita faciendū sit disputare insolētissimæ insaniæ est.* If ỹ whole church do vse any thing, only to call it in question whether that thing should be so don, is a poinct of most prowd or most strāge madnes. But Augustine is not so generall, for his words are, *si quid horū*, if any of these things, speaking of ceremonial obseruations, as of receiuing the cōmunion fasting &c. be vniuersally vsed of all the church, when it is not cōtrary to the word of God, it were madnes to striue about it. For in the first place, Augustine setteth the auctority of Gods word, & secōdly the custome of the vniuersal church being not contrary to Gods word, & last of all, the customs of particular churches, which are varied according to the diuersities of cōtries & natiōs. Now for these matters in cōtrouersy betwene vs, I answer, as Augustine doth to the questiō of Ianuarius, immediatly after the words cited by Bristow. *Sed neq; hoc neq; illud est in eo quod tu quæris.* But neither is this nor that, in the question that thou propoundest: that is neither the practise of the vniuersall church, nor the auctority of the Scriptures, serueth to decide this question but it is the third kind. So say I to Bristow, nether the auctority of the holy Scriptures, nor the practise of the vniuersall church, can be shewed for these things, which thou defēdest, but they

are of a third kind, that is contrary to the word of God and the practise of the most auncient Primitiue church But Augustine (sayth Bristow) proueth that infants are borne in sinne against the Pelagians, which are reuiued in Protestãts, by the customes & practise of the church, which was to baptise thẽ for remission of sinnes. *And this practise he called the waight of truth, & a most plaine bignes of truth.* The slaũder, that Pelagiãs are aliue in Protestãts, by denying children to be borne in sinne, I wil no more esteme, then the barking of a dogge against the moone. But where he sayth, that Augustine by the only practise of the church, cõuinceth the Pelagians calling the practise *põdus veritatis &* cit is a shameles lye, for his words " are in the same *Epist.* 105. *Circumstringuntur enim & diuinarum auctoritate lectionũ, & antiquitus tradito & retẽto firmo Ecclesiæ ritu in baptismate paruulorum.* For they are compassed about, both by the auctoritie of the diuine readings, & also by the stedfast practise of the church, deliuered of old & reteined in the baptisme of infants. But he vrgeth them with exorcisme and exsufflation, which were there vsed in the church: I confesse, but their meaning by exufflatiõ & exorcisme, he defendeth out of the Scriptures. And who can blame Augustine, if after he haue mightely confuted the Pelagians out of the Scriptures, to shew the nouelty of their heresie, he alleaged the perpetuall practise of the church, which she alwaies had & alwaies shall haue in praying for the conuersion of infidels, & for the perseuerãce of the faithful in goodnes. This is all one (saith Bristow) *as if we should reason against these heretikes out of priuate mens beades & out of the publike prayers which are in the portuse or Breuiary, or in the missall and such like bokes.* The deuill it is, except Bristow can proue, that such beades and prayers, were euer vsed in the church. For Augustine sayth *de bono perseuer. ca.* 22 " *Atque vtinam tardi corde, & infirmi qui non possunt, vel non* " *dum possunt Scripturas vel earum expositiones intelligere, sic* " *audient vel non audirent in hac quæstione disputationes nostras, vt magis intuerentur orationes suas, quas semper habuit*

huis & habebit ecclesia ab exordijs suis, donec finiatur hoc se- »
culum. And I would they that are dull of hart & weake, »
which can not, or as yet can not, vnderstand the Scriptures or the expositions of them, would so heare or not heare our disputations in this question, that they would rather consider their owne prayers, which the church alwaies hath had & shall haue, from her beginning vntil this world be ended. You see plainly, that Augustine ioyneth to the auctority of the holy Scriptures, the perpetuall practise of the church which hath continued from the beginning and shall remayne vnto the ende. Which seeing it can not be shewed for Poperie, the argument of the practise of the church serueth not for Popery. Bristowe proceedeth and passeth ouer the example of Christian women, which killed them selues, rather then they would haue their bodies abused, yet notwithstanding by the churches iudgement were honored as martyrs To which I aunswere, the church considered their minde which was good, & not the fact which was euell. At last he commeth to affirme that the Popish church neuer made any chaunge of religion. Which is a shameless assertion, although he say that none of his aduersaries is able to charge them with any alteration since Augustines time. For to omitte the whole scope of doctrine, cleane peruerted, I will obserue only the practise of the church in Augustines time, about the Lords supper. In that time the lay people did receaue the communion in both kindes and one thousand yeres almost after, which of late the Papistes haue altered. In Augustines time, the communion was geuen to infantes which the Papistes doe not obserue, therefore they can not bragge of perpetuall practise and deny all chaunge in religion made by them. But Bristow not content with this vayne bragge, will go farther and shewe that whatsoeuer they haue vsed sithe S. Augustines time, *was obserued euen so in all that time that passed betweene S. Paule and S. Augustine.* Is not this a master of impudence, to promise that which all the worlde of learned

men doth know to be impoſſible to be performed, and whereof the promiſer himſelfe, can bring no profe at all but his bare worde. For he beginneth with exorciſme and exſufflation, which as it was vſed in Auguſtines time vnneceſſarily, ſo it appeareth by Cyprian, that was long before him, that it was vſed for the caſting out of the deuill in them whoſe bodies he did ſenſibly poſſeſſe. *lib. 3. cap. 7. ad Magnum.* Of the ſacrifice of the Maſſe, worſhipping of the Sacrament, and oblation for the deade, as Briſtow referreth the reader to his fift and ſeuenth motiues ſo doe I to mine aunſweres vnto the ſame. Concerning the vſe of the altare, howe truly he ſayth, I referre the reader to mine anſwere of D. Heſkins *lib. 3. cap. 31.* The other fonde reaſon of the practiſe of the church, that children were taught to beleue the reall preſence of Chriſt in the Sacrament, for which he citeth *Aug. de Tim. lib. 3. cap. 10.* which the poore man borowed out of Allens booke of Purgatory, is diſcuſſed & anſwered in my confutation of the ſame treatiſe *lib. 2 cap. 9.* Then followeth going on pilgrimage, to holy places, worſhipping of reliques, prayer vnto Sainctes, vſed (as he ſayth) in Auguſtines time. For worſhipping of reliques and praying to Sainctes, he citeth *Aug. de cura pro mor.* Who concludeth *that to be buried at ſome memorie of the martyrs doth in this poynct only auayle the dead, that the affection of ſupplication commending him alſo to the patronage of the martyr may be encreaſed.* That this was no perpetuall practiſe of the church to deſire the interceſſion of Sainctes, it is manifeſt by this, that Auguſtine him ſelfe dare affirme nothing certeinly, whether or how the Sainctes may heare our prayers. Affirming that this queſtion paſſeth the power of his vnderſtanding *cap. 16.* But by the name of memory, Briſtow will vnderſtande relique, becauſe it is ſomtime ſo vſed, which is no ſtrong argument. But admitte it were ſo, how can he proue, either that practiſe to haue bene continued from S. Paule to S. Auguſtine or the ſame opinion of reliques to haue ben in Auguſtines time, which is mainteined in the

the Popiſh church? that there was ſuperſtitious peregrinatiõ vnto Ieruſalem &c. vſed in S. Hieroms time, it is as true as that the ſame was reproued of him *Ep. ad Paul.* If God ſhewed any miracles at the deade bodyes of the Martyrs, to confirme that religion for which they ſuffred againſt the Gentiles it foloweth not that the reliques of dead Saints are to be worſhiped, kiſſed, ſaught vnto by pilgrimage &c, but moſt abſurd is it, that Briſtow would haue Hierome by ofte entering into the Cryptos or vaultes of churches at Rome, to ſignifie that he went a Pilgrimage. Hierome was not ſo groſe, to accounte walking about the Citie to be a Preregrination. But what is ſo leaden or blockiſhe, which theſe doltiſh Papiſts will not auouch for the mainteinaunce of their trompery. Laſt of all he chargeth the Proteſtantes, with an impudent attempt, in making ſuch an vniuerſall chaunge of the whole face of Religion, which none of the olde Heretikes did before thē. That we are like to none of the olde Heretikes, we like our ſelues neuer the worſe, but as concerning the vniuerſall chaunge, it was neceſſary in reformation where there was an vniuerſal Apoſtacie. For any alteratiõ that we haue made, the Papiſtes dare not affirme for ſhame, that wee haue brought any thing into the Church which ought not to be vſed by the worde of God: neither are they able to proue that we haue omitted anything, which by the holy ſcripture is neceſſaryly required. To cõclude, you ſee that the practiſe of the church, except it be perpetuall, euen from the firſt beginning, is no Motiue by Auguſtines iudgement, and that Briſtowe though hee hath bragged much thereof, for ſome ſuperſtitions vſed of olde, yet he hath brought nothing, to proue that they haue beene from the beginning.

The 12. Motiue is the 28. demaunde.

Sea apoſtolike. The communion of the Biſhop of Rome to be kept of all Chriſtians. The Romain Church is the Ca- Briſtow.

tholike Church. Saint Auguſtine of our religion. Such as are condemned by the Sea Apoſtolike are holden for Heretikes. Pelagians alive againe in Proteſtants. Emperours and other peeres of our Religion, as alſo their firſt conuerſion. S. Theodoret, Chriſoſtom, and Hierome of our Religion. Antichriſtes ſide againſt the Pope. Proteſtants doe decay and ſhall come to nothing.

Fulke. *VVhoſoeuer* (ſayth Briſtow) *at any time were for their doing or teaching condemned by the definitiue ſentence of the Sea Apoſtolike, and ſtubbernly condemned the ſame, they were Sciſmatikes or heretikes. And contrariwiſe, all Catholike men haue kept them ſelues in the vnitie of that ſea, and if for any cauſe they were out of it, labouring to be reconciled againe, or if they had beene but ſuſpected, neuer ceaſing vntill they had made their purgation.* Moreouer he ſaith, *there can none example be alleadged to the contrary, but innumerable for it.* It is not denyed, but the Church and Sea of Rome, while it continued in true catholike Religion, was much reuerenced euery where, ſo farre at leaſt as the Romane empire did extende. But when any Biſhop of that ſea, went out of the way, either in ſciſme or hereſie, they were not followed but reſiſted, & condemned. For Example, When Victor biſhop of Rome like a proude ſciſmatike, did take vpon him to excommunicate all the Churches of the Eaſt, for celebration of Eaſter, they did not onely contemne his cenſure, but many Biſhops alſo did ſharply rebuke him, as Irenæus Biſhop of Lyons: & other. *Euſe. li. 5. ca. 25.* Whé Liberius biſhop of Rome relented vnto the Arrians, he was forſaken of the true Chriſtians, and accounted an Heretike. *Hier. in Catal.* When Bonifacius, Zoſimus and Celeſtinus, Biſhops of Rome, would chalenge appellations out of Africa, contrary to the decrees out of the councels of Africa, by counterfaiting a Canon of the Nicene councell, they were reſiſted by all the Biſhops of Africa, and the trechery diſcouered. *Caic. Aphric. ad celeſt.* To theſe examples adde Pope Honorius, cõdemned in the

the generall councell of Conſtantinople the ſixt, for a Monothelite. Euen the popiſh councell of Conſtans, depoſed three Popes. But now let vs ſee Briſtowes wiſe examples. The Pelagians (which he ſaith, but ſheweth not how) are aliue in Proteſtants, were condemned by the Apoſtolike Sea as witneſſeth Auguſtine. *Epiſt.* 106. And this iudgement of the Catholike Church, the Emperour Honorius confirmed as teſtifieth Poſſidonius and Auguſtine. What then? Ergo Saint Auguſtine and the Emperours were of our Religion. If the Pelagians had beene condemned by the authoritie of the Byſhoppe of Rome, without conuiction out of the holy Scriptures, the Example had beene to ſome purpoſe. But when their hereſie was bothe by Preaching, writing, diſputing and Councell declared to be contrarie to the worde of God, then if the Byſhoppe of Rome ſubſcrybed to his condemnation, as one of the true Patriarches of the Church within the Romaine Empire, what doth this aduaunce the ſingularitie of his Sea? For examples of Catholickes purging them ſelues, Firſte he nameth Chryſoſtome in his Epiſtle to Innocentius the ſixt of Rome, but ſetteth downe none of his woordes, as in deede there is no ſuch matter in that Epiſtle, onely he ſheweth howe iniuriouſly hee was handled by the barbarous Souldiers. His next example is: Theodoretus Byſhoppe of Cyrus, who beeing vniuſtly depoſed, appealed to Leo Byſhoppe of Rome, which conſidering of his caſe indifferently, conſented to his reſtitution in the councell of Chalcedon. But that Theodoret would not haue accounted him ſelfe an Heretike or ſciſmatike, although he had beene condemned by Leo, it is plaine by theſe words. *Veſtrã enim expecto ſententiam. &c.* For I expect your ſentence, and if you » commaund me to ſtand vnto that which hath beene » iudged againſt me, I will ſtande vnto, it neither will I » trouble any man heereafter about it, bnt will expect » the iudgement of our God and Sauiour, which can- »

not be altered. Theſe wordes declare, that Theodoret although the Biſhop of Rome alſo ſhoulde be deceyued to confirme his depriuation, by his ſentence, yet he woulde not thinke him ſelfe to be an heretike, but quietly waight for the iudgement of God, which could not be deceyued, as the iudgement of man was. Wherfore Theodoret was farre from acknowledging thoſe popiſh principles. That the Pope can not erre, that his iudgement is all one with the iudgement of God. Although the myſterie of iniquitie in the Biſhop of Romes prerogatiue, had by that tyme wrought very highe. The ſubmiſſion of Hierome to Pope Damaſus, you ſhall finde aunſwered in my confutation of Saunders rocke *cap.* 15. where you ſhall ſee how the Church of Rome was called Catholike, while it was ſo in deede, and howe Antichriſtes ſide was againſt the Biſhop of Rome, namely ſo longe as the Biſhop of Rome was on Chriſtes ſide. Whether Proteſtantes in England haue decayed and Papiſtes increaſed, as Briſtow braggeth, for theſe 16. yeares, let wiſe men iudge. Although want of ſeuere diſcipline hath cauſed many to remaine obſtinate, and ſome perhaps that were of no religion, to fall to Popery, yet for the number, it is altogether falſe, that Briſtow ſo confidently affirmeth.

The 13. motiue is the 27. demaund.

Briſtow. *Councells. The Apoſtles were of our religion. Parliaments religion. The councell of Trent. Councells. S. Auguſtines motiue.*

Fulke. *Whoſoeuer hath bene condemned by any councell* (ſayth Briſtow) *generall or prouinciall confirmed by the ſea Apoſtolike, They were heretikes, neither can there againſt this be brought any exception.* I will bringe ſuch exceptions, as Briſtow for both his eares dare not affirme the parties ſo condemned, to be heretikes. Liberius Biſhop of Rome, was firſt a good Catholike, ſo farre that for refuſing

fuſing to ſatisfie the Emperour Conſtantius, which required him to ſubſcribe to the vniuſt depriuation of Athanaſius, he was caried into baniſhment, and one Felix a good Catholike alſo, yet by faction of the Arrians, was choſen Biſhop of Rome in his place. But afterward, Liberius ſollicited and perſwaded by one Fortunatianus as S. Hierome witneſſeth *in catal.* and through wearines of his baniſhment as Marianus Scotus teſtifieth, ſubſcribed to the hereſie of Arrius, and returned to Rome like a Conquerour. For whoſe returne and depriuation of Felix, Conſtantius gathered a councell, which was confirmed by Liberius, as teſtifieth Pope Damaſus in his pontificall. *Conſtantius Auguſtus fecit concilium cum hæreticis ſimul etiam cum Vrſacio & Valente, & eiecit Felicem de Epiſcopatu qui erat Catholicus, & reuocauit Liberium.* Conſtantius the Emperour held a councell with the heretikes and alſo with Vrſacius and Valens, and did caſt out Felix which was a Catholike out of his biſhoprike, and called backe Liberius. And againe: *Ingreſſus Liberius in vrbem Romam 4. nonas Auguſti, conſenſit Conſtantio hæretico, non tamen rebaptizatus eſt, ſed conſenſum præbuit.* Liberius after he entred into the citie of Rome the 4. of the nones of Auguſt, he conſented to Conſtantius the heretike, but yet he was not rebaptized, but he gaue his conſent. Let Briſtow aduiſe him ſelfe, which of the Popes he dare call heretike. If he condemne Felix and iuſtifie Liberius, then hath he S. Hierome againſt him and Pope Damaſus, which can not erre. Another exception I will bringe of Pope Honorius the firſt, condemned and accurſed for an heretike by the generall councell of Conſtantinople the ſixt, confirmed by Pope Leo the 2. and that not generally but by ſpeciall wordes, *pariterq; anathematizamus noui erroris inuentores &c. nec non & Honorium qui hanc apoſtolicam Eccleſiam non apoſtolicæ traditionis doctrina luſtrauit, ſed profana prædicatione immaculatam fidem ſubuertere conatus eſt.* And likewiſe we accurſe the inuentors of the newe errour &c: and alſo Honorius

"which did not lighten this apoſtolike Church, with "doctrine of Apoſtolike tradition but by profane prea-"ching went about to ouerthrowe the vndefiled faith. "The ſame Pope Honorius is condemned in the ſe-cond councell of Nice confirmed alſo by the Pope A-drian. Notwithſtanding all this, I would Briſtow were ſo hardy on his head, to graunt that Honorius was an he-retike. I might ioyne to theſe, three Popes condemned by the councell of Conſtance, confirmed by Pope Iohn 23. One of the three. alſo the condemnation of Pope Eugenius by the councell of Baſil, confirmed by Pope Nicolas and Felix. But the other are ſufficient exceptions againſt Briſtowes falſe principle. Now whatſoeuer he prateth of auctority of councelles, is to no purpoſe. For we acknowledge how neceſſary ſynods are for the church of Chriſt, with the Apoſtles, whom the fond mā boaſteth to be of theyr religion, becauſe they helde a councell. Not conſidering howe they determined the controuerſie, only by auctority of the holy Scriptures, as it is manifeſt *Act.* 15. And what councell ſoeuer followeth that rule, we gladly embrace, and that is the cauſe, why the parliament ioyneth, the foure firſt generall councells with the Scriptures, in triall of hereſie, not that thoſe councels are of equall auctority with the worde of God, but in that they agree with the ſame, in condemning the hereſies of Artius, Macedonius, Neſtorius and Eutiches. That proude ſcoffe of Parliament religion, bewraieth the ſtomake of a Vauntparler, & not the ſpirit of a diuine or good ſubiect. Popery was alſo confirmed by Parliament in Queene Maryes time, therefore it was Parliament Religion. But where as he would compare the laſte rablement of Trent, in all pointes with thoſe ancient holy Councels, he doth e-uen as much as if he would goe about to proue an Ape to be a man. But I may not omit that in ſhewing the ne-ceſſitie of the Popes confirmation of Councels, out of Annianus Marcellus, Lib. 15. Hee helpeth the matter with falſifying the writer, for he deliuereth his wordes thus

thus, *auctoritate quæ potiores æternæ vrbis Epiſcopi*, with the authoritie in which the Biſhops of the eternall city are better whereas the word is *potiuntur*, by that authoritie which the Biſhops of Rome haue or doe enioy. But if we ſhall beleeue Marcellinus an heathen writer. Liberius Biſhop of Rome, was of the ſame mind in condemnation of Athanaſius, that the reſt of the Biſhops were, which proceeded againſt him, but that he thought it not reaſon, to ſubſcribe to his condemnation before he had ſeene and heard him. For thus Ammon writeth.

Hunc per ſubſcriptionem abiicere ſede ſacerdotali, paria ſentiens cæteris iubente principe, Liberius monitus perſeueranter renitebatur, nec viſum hominem nec auditum damnare nefas vltimum ſæpe exclamans, apertè ſcilicet recalcitrans imperatoris arbitrio. Id enim ille Athanaſio ſemper infeſtius, licet ſciret impletum, tamen auctoritate quæ potiuntur æternæ vrbis Epiſcopi firmari deſiderio nitebatur ardente. This man (ſpeaking of Athanaſius condemned before by a Synode of Biſhops) Liberius being of the ſame opinion with the reſt, warned by the Princes commaundement, did ſtiffly refuſe by ſubſcription to caſt out of his prieſtly ſeate, crying out often tymes, that it was extreme wickednes, to condemne a man being nether heard nor ſeene, ſo openly kicking againſt the Emperours pleaſure. Who although he which being alwayes an enemy to Athanaſius, knew that it was already fulfilled, yet he labored with earneſt deſire, to haue it confirmed by the authoritie which the Biſhops of the eternall citie haue. There can nothing els be gathered of this, but that Conſtantius, knowing Athanaſius to be depriued by a councell of Biſhops of the Eaſt, would haue Liberius Biſhop of Rome, to conſent to his condemnation, becauſe Athanaſius was one of the foure Patriarchs, & was not to be condéned, but by the reſt of the Patriarches. Not that it was then thought, that all councels were inſufficient, except they had the Popes confirmation, as Briſtow doth dreame.

But Briſtow ſayth, the Proteſtants regarde no coun-

cells, becauſe they ſuffer Lewys Euans in a naughtye booke to cal the councel of Chalcedon a blaſphemous, proude, ſacrilegious Antichriſtian Councell. This Lewys Euans while he was a Papiſt, and did write from Louayne in defence of Papiſtrye, was accompted of you a learned man, a ſober man, a godly man, but now that God in great mercye, hath opened his eyes to ſee and acknowledge the light of the Goſpell, you rayle on him and ſlaunder him at your pleaſure. For if you had bene able to iuſtifie your reproche, you woulde haue noted in which of his bookes, ſeeinge he hath written many, and in what leafe and lyne he had written ſo vnreuerently of that Councell. Howſoeuer it be, he is able to aunſwer you him ſelfe: Although if he haue erred in the name or iudgement of that councell, it were ſmall reaſon to charge all the Proteſtantes in England, with one priuate mans error.

The laſt is, that Councells were S. Auguſtines motiue, becauſe he writeth, that euen prouinciall Councells, muſt giue place without all doubt to generall Councells. *De bapt. cont. Don. lib.* 2. *cap.* 3. but what writeth Auguſtine immediatly after? *Ipſáque plenaria ſæpe priora poſterioribus emendari cum aliquo experimento rerum aperitur quod clauſum erat, & cognoſcitur quod latebat ſine vllo typo ſacrilegæ ſuperbiæ, ſine inflata cernice arrogantiæ, ſine vlla contentione liuidæ inuidiæ, cum ſancta humilitate, cum pace Catholica, cum charitate Chriſtiana.* Who knoweth not, ſayth Auguſtine. That euen generall Councells are often tymes, the former corrected by the later, when by any tryall of thinges, that is opened which before was ſhutte, and that is knowen which before was hidde, without any ſwellinge of ſacrilegious pride, without any ſwellinge ſtubbernes of arrogance, without any contention of ſpightfull enuye, with holye humilitie, with Catholike peace, with chriſtian charitie. What ſaye you Sainct Auguſtine? haue generall Councells often erred, that the former were corrected by the later? If you mayntayne this ſaying, you

you ſhall be no longer of Briſtowes religion.

The 14. motiue is the 26 demaund.

The fathers. Pelagians alike in Proteſtants. The fathers. S. Auguſtines motiue. Proteſtants be aſhamed of their fathers. Of what religion and authoritie the fathers were. L. Humfries opinion of Iewells chalenge of the fathers, and of the Sainctes in the Calender. Briſtow.

Briſtow woulde haue it conſidered *whether euer any Catholike man in matters of fayth, did obſtinately refuſe to beleue the olde fathers conſenting in one and agreeing together, but onely ſuch as were heretikes.* I aunſwer Briſtow playeth the captious, and yet fooliſhe Sophiſter. For in this firſt demaunde, he ſeemeth to vnderſtand all the olde fathers conſenting together, but in the reſt of the chapter he playnely ſpeaketh, but of ſome of the olde writers: nowe there is great difference betwene all and ſome. For we denye nothing that all the olde fathers did conſent vpon, although we denye ſome thing that ſome of the olde fathers did allowe. For example, we denye prayers for the deade, which ſome of the olde writers did allowe. But if Briſtow woulde breake his heade in peeces with ſtudye, he ſhall neuer be able to proue, that all the olde writers did mayntayne prayer for the deade, the like I ſaye of prayer vnto Sainctes, and of ſome prerogatiue of the Biſhop of Rome ouer other Biſhops, of ſome ceremonies &c: which being the dregges of a great quantitie of good liquor contayned in the veſſells of diuerſe of the olde writers, and yet of the later ſorte of them, the Papiſtes haue onely ſucked out, letting all the good liquor to runne beſide them. And like impudent dogges yolpe & barke againſt vs, that the fathers are all of their ſide, and contrarye to vs: with as good reaſon, as one that hath gotten the excrementes of a man, ſhoulde boaſt Fulke.

boast that he hath the same man in possession. I thinke the reader can not but laughe, when he readeth it so often noted by Bristow. Pelagians aliue in Protestantes. When of all olde heresies we are further from none, nor Papistes nearer to any, then to the heresie of the Pelagians. But why troe ye are Pelagians aliue in Protestants? Because Augustine writing against Iulian the Pelagian *lib. 1 cap. 2.* sayth of the fathers, *Quod credunt credo &c.* That which they beleue I beleue also. I holde that they holde, I teache that they teach, I preach that they preach, and *lib. 2. quos oportet &c. Christian people ought to preferre the auncient holy truth, before your profane nouelties and chose rather to sticke to them then to you.* And are Pelagians aliue in Protestants, because Augustine receiueth the olde writers, that were agreeable to the scriptures? Did not the Pelagians alledge the authority of the old writers also? *Lib cont. Iul. cap. 2. & 3.* But what should I contend about that, which is so cleare in Augustine. *De baptism cont. Donatist. cap. 2. Quis autem nescias sanctam scripturam canonicam tam veteris quam noui testamenti, certis suis terminis contineri? eamq; omnibus posteriboribus Episcoporum literis ita præponi, vt de illa omnino dubitari & disceptari non possit, vtrum verum vel vtrum rectum sit quicquid in ea scriptum esse constiterit: Episcoporum autem literas quæ post confirmatum canonem vel scriptæ sunt vel scribuntur, & per sermonem forte sapientiorem cuiuslibet in ea re peritioris, & per aliorum Episcoporum grauiorem auctoritatem doctiorumq; prudentiam, & per concilia licere reprehendi si quid in eis forte à veritate deuiatum est, & ipsa concilia &c.* Who knoweth not, that the holy canonical scripture both of the old and new testament, is conteyned in their certeine bands: and that the same is so preferred before all later writings of Bishops, that of it there can be no doubt or question at all, whether that be true or right, whatsoeuer is knowen to be written therein. But as for the writings of Bishops, which since the canon is confirmed haue bene written, or be nowe in writing, that by some speach perhaps more wise of any man

man that is more ſkilfull in that matter, and by the more graue authoritie of other Biſhops, and wiſedom of them that are better learned, and by councells they may be reprehended, if any thinge perhaps in them is gone a ſtraye from the truth, and that euen thoſe councells which are holde in euery region and prouince, without all controuerſie doe giue place to the authoritie of generall councels which are made out of all the Chriſtian worlde, and that euen the generall councells are often tymes corrected the former by the later &c. as in the 13. motiue. By which ſaying you may playnly ſee, howe the olde fathers were S. Auguſtines motiue, euen none otherwiſe, then they are our retentiue, to ſtaye vs in Chriſtian truthe, which they write agreeable to the holye Scriptures, and therefore it is an impudent ſlaunder of Briſtowe bothe where he ſaythe, that in our preachinge and writinge *we thinke it not neceſſary to alledge the teſtimonies of the olde fathers*, and alſo that in familiar talke amonge our ſelues *we are not afearde plainely to confeſſe, that the fathers all were Papiſtes.*

As vayne a cauill it is, that the Proteſtantes are aſhamed of their fathers: When we acknowledge no fathers, vnto whoſe iudgement we will ſtande abſolutely in all controuerſies, but the Prophetes and the Apoſtles and God him ſelfe, by whoſe ſpirite they did write. As for Simon Magus, Eunomius, and ſuche olde heretikes we deteſt, more then the Papiſtes doe. But Ærius, Vigilantius, and Iouinian were playnely of our opinion, and of them we are aſhamed. And doe you Papiſtes beleeue nothinge common with AErius, Vigilantius, Iouinian? Doe you in no poynte holde that which Arius, Macedonius, Eutyches did holde? Doe you mayntayne no opinion which was taught by Mahomet him ſelfe? you will aunſwer, that there neuer was hereſie, but it holde and taught many articles of truthe, which if you holde as they did, you are not therefore their children, in ſuche articles

wherin they were heretikes. Euen ſo we aunſwere you of AErius, Vigilantius, Iouinian, we'are not aſhamed to beleue any truth which they helde, their errours we leaue vnto them ſelues. But I know you will replye, that among the errours of AErius, the denyall of prayers to profit the deade was one accompted by Epiphanius and Auguſtine. Then it is your parte to ſhewe, what argumentes out of the holy Scripture they bring to proue this opinion to be an errour. Otherwiſe their auctoritie alone, is not ſufficient to make it a truth. Vigilantius is baighted only by Hierome, of other learned men in his time, he was counted a godly man, and a learned. As for Iouinian, we take not his parte, if in all reſpects he made mariage equall with virginitie, which in ſome reſpect the Apoſtle preferreth. But we muſt ſee of what religion and auctoritie, the fathers were. Firſt ſayth Briſtow you may perceaue by Iewells challenge, that for Purgatorie, prayer for the dead and to Saincts, merite of good workes &c. there is ſomthing conteined in the olde fathers which liued within 600. yeares after Chriſt, becauſe he durſt not make his challenge of theſe articles, but of the Maſſe, the Pope, the euchariſtie &c. But I pray you Briſtow, are not theſe greater matters among you, then the other?

If therefore you be not able to proue your greateſt myſteries of antiquitie, out of any one father for ſo many ages, what great matter is it, if you haue them fauourable in a fewe articles of leſſe moment? But Briſtow with wayght of reaſon will beare vs downe, that all the fathers are on their ſide wholly, and againſt vs in all poynctes of our controuerſie. And this is his reaſon: who are driuen to mayteyne the fathers credit and auctoritie, Papiſtes or Proteſtantes? Not Proteſtantes verily, but Papiſtes, ergo the fathers be all for Papiſtes and againſt Proteſtantes. A mightie reaſon of mayne force. Dioſcorus and Eutyches in the councell of Chalcedon boaſted of the auctoritie of the holie fathers, and ſtoode much in defenſe of their credit

creditte therefore the fathers were whollie on their ſide.

But let vs heare L. Humfreys opinion out of his booke of B. Iewells life, of Iewells challenge, of the fathers and of the Saincts in the calender. Nay rather let vs heare Briſtow yelping like a little curre agaynſt ſo great a lyon. Firſt he ſnatcheth peeces of his ſentences gnawne from the reſt, and then ſqueleth out as though he had hearde ſome maruelous ſtraunge ſoundes. D. Humfrey ſayth, Iewell gaue the Papiſtes too large a ſcope, when not content to haue beaten them downe with the auctoritie of the holy Scriptures, he made his challenge vpon the teſtimonie of the fathers, and that ſo many hundreth yeares after Chriſt. And herein he was iniurious to him ſelfe, that refuſing that meane by which he might more eaſely & more ſtraightly haue maynteyned his cauſe, after a maner he ſpoyled him ſelfe and the church. This is his opinion of Maiſter Iewells challenge. Howe followeth his opinion of the fathers and of the Saincte in the calender. This thing (ſayth D. Humfrey) he did not with his wil, but yet he did it not without a cauſe, that he might ſtrike you through with the teſtimonie of your fathers, as it were with your owne ſworde. For it had beene manlie for a Chriſtian man to ſay. Thus ſayth the Lorde. It had bene ſufficient to haue layed agaynſt you. Your doctrine is contrarie to the Scripture. For it is the queſtion of men poſſeſſed with deuills to ſay: What haue we to doe with thee Ieſus thou ſonne of Dauid? But it is an interrogation of the Saynctes. What haue we to doe with our fathers with fleſhe and bloode? You heare by theſe wordes, what a daungerous opinion he holdeth of the fathers and of the Saynctes in the calender, namelie that the fathers are no farther to be followed, then they followed the holie Scriptures, and that the Saincte either liuing or deade, whether they be in the calender or no, deny their fathers as fleſhe and bloode if they be in any

respect an hinderance for them to obey the will of their father in heauen.

These are the perillous opinios, that Bristow brableth against falsifying his words by ommission & deprauing his meaning by false surmising.

But Bristow hath yet an other reason to proue the fathers to be in all poinctes of their side. *If in all poinctes* (sayth he) *they be not with the Protestants, then vndoubtedly in all poynctes they be with vs.* And what is the reason of this monstruous conclusion? *There was neuer but one true religion.* As though none can be of true religion but such as erreth in nothing. But who would spend incke and paper to confute such vaine reasonings.

The 15. motiue conteineth the 15. 16. and 20. demaundes.

Bristow. *Martyrs. S. Stephen of our religion. Pilgrimage. Churches confirmed by vision. Miracles for reliques and for necessitie of childrens baptisme. Confirming of children, the custome and practise of Gods church. Foxes martyrs. Miracles for our martyrs.*

Fulke. Al martyrs that euer suffred for the testimony of true religion, since Abel, were numbred of one true church, euen of the same that we are. But Bristow would binde vs to the Saincts in the calender, termed by L. Humfrey Sāctuli, which terme yea & a worse, might serue a number of thē. Notwithstanding so many of those calēddred & canonized Saincts as be Saincts in heauen and not firebrands in hell, were of that church which is builded vpon the foundation of the Prophets and Apostles, Iesus Christ being the head corner stone. And therefore it is a fooliish requeast, that we should name any one of thē, which was of our faith. But it is a pleasant pastime, to heare howe Bristow proueth S. Stephen to be of his religion. It is manifest (sayth he) that he is of the religion

gion of the reſt of the martyrs, meaning Papiſtes, becauſe it is proued, that he as well as they, had heard & helped thē, which prayed to them, which worſhipped their reliques, & went a pilgrimage to their churches, & he ſpecially reuealing by viſion, the place where his reliques were hidden with the reliques of S. Gamaliel, & S. Nicodemus: vnto one Lucian, a Prieſt of Ieruſalem, which wrote in Greeke the hiſtory of his inuention. To this inuention, I anſwere, that it is an inuention of the deuill, either by meanes of him that counterfaited the viſion, or by ſending a ſtronge illuſion, & ſo I ſay generally of all ſuch miracles and viſions, as are alleaged, to proue any doctrine contrarie to the holy Scriptures. As for the vanitie of this epiſtell of Lucian, it bewrayeth it ſelfe in that he maketh Gamaliel the Pharizee, ſo great a Sainct, who for any thing that we can read in the holy Scripture, was neuer a Chriſtian. S. Paule in the 22. of the Actes, appealeth to the knowledge of the Iewes, that he was brought vp in Iudaiſme, vnder Gamaliel, which if after he had bene conuerted to Chriſtianity it ſhoulde haue bene greatly ſuſpected that S. Paule had bene noſelled vp by him, and not conuerted by a viſion from heauen, as his intent was to ſhew.

From this counterfait ſtuffe of Lucians epiſtell, he ſendeth vs to the new founde ſermons of Auguſtine, to whom he would get credit, by Auguſtines owne report, *De ciuit. 22. ca. 8.* but in vaine, for Auguſtine ſpeaketh not of any ſuch ſermons, but only, when report of a miracle was brought vnto him, that he went vnto the church & ſpake a few things of the matter. And touching all ſuch miracles as he reporteth of Stephen, his concluſion is this, God was glorified by them, and the faith for which Stephen died, was magnified. But of worſhipping of reliques, pilgrimage &c. there is no mention, and yet that chapter of miracles, as Ludouicus Viues doth confeſſe, is notably corrupted, as appeared to him, by ancient copies. The concluſion was, *Quid erat in cordibus exultantium niſi fides Chriſti, pro qua Stephani ſanguis*

« *fusus est?* What was in the hartes of them that reioyſed, « but the faith of Chriſt, for which the blood of Stephen « was ſhed?

The miracle which Briſtow reporteth out of the 38. *Serm. in diuus & 96. in noua editione* to proue the neceſſitie of baptiſme for infants & the practiſe of the church for confirmation of children, & praying to S. Stephen is an impudēt fiction, as appeareth manifeſtly by this, that he calleth a ſucking babe *Catechumenū*, one that was inſtructed in Chriſtian religion, which could not poſſibly be, before he was of yeares of capacity. Secondly the infants of Chriſtian parents, in Auguſtins time, were baptiſed as ſone as they were borne, & taried not vntil they were *Catechumeni*, that is enſtructed. Thirdly the woman in this fable, praying to S. Stephen, perſwadeth him to know the purpoſe of her hart, which the word of God affirmeth to be known only to God. As impudent as the deuiſer of that fable was, is Briſtow, who citeth out of Auguſtine *De vnitat. eccleſ. cap.* 16. a few words rent a ſunder from the reſt, cōcerning miracles, which the whole diſcourſe, ſheweth to be plainly againſt him, as you may read in this aunſwere in the 8. motiue of viſions. After this followeth a compariſon of Foxes martyrs, with the Popiſh martyrs, *Videlicet the good Earle of Northumberlande, Storie, Feltons, Nortons, Wodhouſe, Plomtree, and ſo many hundrethes of the Northerne men*, all rebells and traytors, yet (ſaith he) approued by miracles vndoubted, but what miracles, he ſheweth not. To theſe he addeth Fiſher, More, the Charterhouſe monkes &c. whoſe cauſe being ſufficiently diſcuſſed by M. Foxe, I referre to the iudgemēt of indifferent readers. But this I can not omit that the traiterous Papiſt, ſlaūdereth our ſtate, not only for publike execution of open rebelles and errant traytors, but alſo with priuie murthering, by poyſoning, whipping, and famiſhing. From all ſuſpition of which wicked practiſes, God be praiſed, the ſtates that are profeſſors of the Goſpell, haue alwayes bene as free, as the Papiſts both by ſtorie & liuing teſtimonie may be proued

proued guiltie of thē. And where hee ſpecially chargeth that learned and reuerend Father M. Elmer now Byſhop of London, with this deuiliſhe practiſe, notinge theſe woordes in the margent, *Let Elmer remember his Tragedie of the Scottiſh friere at Lincolne.* As I knowe not what coulour he hath for ſo great and haynous a ſlaūder, ſo I nothing doubt, but that the ſame is vtterly falſe and vntrue, as a thouſand more ſlaunders and lyes, Wherein the Papiſts, as Children of the Father of lyes haue ſo great delight. To conclude, ſeeing not the paine, but the cauſe maketh a martyr, whoſoeuer haue ſuffred for treaſon and rebellion, may well be accounted Martirs of the Popiſh Church, but the church of Chriſte condemneth ſuch for enemies of Chriſtes kingdome and inheritours of eternal deſtructiō, except they repent and obtaine mercie for their horrible wickednes. And ſeeing patient ſuffring is by Briſtows owne confeſſion, a gift of God, vnto all true Martirs, ſuch as were manifeſtly voide of patience, can be no true Martirs, as were moſt of theſe rebels & traitors, & Story by name. Who for all his glorious tale, in the time of his moſt deſerued execution by quartering, was ſo impatiēt that he did not only rore and cry like a helhounde, but alſo ſtrake the executioner doing his office, and reſiſted as long as ſtrength did ſerue him, beeing kept downe by three or foure men, vntil he was deade. O patient martir of the popiſh church. In the 15. & 16. demaund, he aſketh vs whether we haue not read in Chryſoſtome, Auguſtine, & others, that they vſed this argument to proue the diuinitie of Chriſt, that he hath aduanced his ſeruants to ſuch honor, that they are prayed vnto, & their graues honored of kings & Emperors, & that miracles are wrought by the reliqus of their Saints, I anſwere we read ſōe ſuch thing, although not altogither as Briſtow reporteth, nor to ẏ end. But what if amōg a great nūber of forcible aguments, they vſed alſo ſome ſuch perſuaſions? ſhuld their reaſoning be a preiudice to the truth of God reueled out of the Scriptures: whervnto if thoſe

holy man had had as great regarde as they wishe other men to haue in their writing, and not suffred them selues to be carried away with common plausible errors, they should easely haue espyed that they gayned not so much in reasoning so against the Painims, as they gaue occasion of superstition among the Christians.

And to aunswere the xx. demaunde, we are content to bee tryed by that doctrine for which the auncient Martyrs Irenæus, Cyprian, Laurens &c. suffred persecution and Martyrdom, which was for no pointe of Popery but true christianitie, yet wil we not be tryed by all poyntes of doctrine which they did holde, for that it is certaine, some of them had their errors which the Papists them selues doe not holde, as Irenæus is charged by Eusebius *lib. 3. cap. 39*, to be a follower of the Chiliastes. Cyprian did openly in a councel, maintaine rebaptising of them which were baptised by Heretikes. Againe wee refuse not the tryall of that doctrine for which the Christians were persecuted by the Arrians in Africa, notwithstanding the terme of Missa vsed by Victor that writeth that Story, by which tearme in that time, not the popish Masse (which then was not made, either in matter or forme) but the celebration of the Communion and memory of the sacrifice of Christ, commonly called in deede, but vnproperly a sacrifice, yet will we not be tryed by all that they holde, for diuerse errors of prayer for the deade and to the dead, were then receiued, neithet will the Papistes be tryed by that Religion they helde in all pointes. For then were Byshops married. Lib. 2. &, 3. Then the Praiers were in the vulgar tounge, and all the people sunge Himnes togither, lib. 2. There is no reason therefore that the Papists shoulde call vs to such a tryall as they dare not abide them selues.

The 16. motiue is the 30. Demaunde.

Their

Their owne Doctors, The diſcorde of Proteſtants. Luther condemneth our Proteſtantes. Carolſtadians, Zwinglians, and Caluiniſts. Luther corrupteth the Scripture to helpe his hereſie of the breade to be Chriſtes body. The head of the church to be a Layman is againſt the Magdeburgenſes and Caluine. The prophecie fulfilled in the accorde of the Proteſtants and Puritants Parliament religion. The inconſtancy of Proteſtants. What an impudent attempt is chaunge of religion. True Chriſtianitie by Luther is vnder the Popedome. Briſtow.

The diſcorde of our owne Doctors: Briſtowe would haue to be a Motiue againſt vs. As though it were not as great a motiue againſt them, whoſe Doctors diſſent as much as ours. To omit all other controuerſies, when will they bee agreed whether the Pope bee aboue the Councell or the Councell aboue the Pope. In which diſcention they haue not onely Doctor againſt Doctor, but alſo Councell againſt Councell, and Pope againſt Pope, and Cardinall againſt Cardinall, as Conſtance and Baſill againſt Ferraria & Florence. Nicolaus & Felix with their Cardinals, againſt Eugenius and and his Cardinals. But now let vs ſee what diſcorde he findeth in our Doctors. *Luther condemneth the Proteſtants, Carolſtadians, Zwinglians & Caluiniſtes in the cauſe of the Sacrament,* The more was his immoderate heate and bitter zeale to be blamed, and their Chriſtian modeſtie to be commended, which notwitſtanding his ouermuch vehemency in maintayning his error, yet accepted him alwayes as a brother. The corruption of the Scripture wherwith he chargeth Luther, is a ſlaunder of his owne, for Luther altred no wordes of Scripture, but declared his vnderſtanding of them, when he ſaid, *Take bread and eate, this is my body.* And this is the only diſcorde that he can proue betweene the profeſſors of the truth. For it is a meere ſophiſtry of the ambiguitie of the worde head of the Church, that maketh that ſhewe of contrarietie betweene the Magdeburgenſes, Caluine, and vs, who in ſence and meaning therof, doe Fulke.

perfectly agree as I haue often ſhewed. And Briſtowe cannot altogether deny where he derideth the Parliament Religion, and inconſtancie of Proteſtants for chaunging the title of head into gouernour, and then expounding the gouernment by iniunction. Whereas in neither of bothe titles was any other meaning of the godly ſorte in the time of King Henry, Kinge Edwarde or her Maieſtie, then is contayned in that expoſition. In deede Stephen Gardiner (as Caluine reporteth) at Ratiſbone, abuſed the title of ſupreme head, not more wickedly thē abſurdly to defend all Papiſtrie, which thē was not aboliſhed by king Henry. And againſt that groſſe errour of Gardiner writeth Caluine and not againſt our vnderſtanding of that tytle. But the Apologie prophecieth that ſhortely the Lutherans and Zwinglians ſhould bee accorded, which is fulfilled in the accorde of the Proteſtantes and Puritanes, who in the demaunde he ſayth doe abhorre the tytle of ſupremacie, If I knewe whome he did meane by Puritanes, I might aunſweare him the better, but ſeeing hee maketh Proteſtantes and Puritanes members of a diuiſion, If hee recken the Puritanes for ſuch as bee no Proteſtantes, let them aunſweare for them ſelues. If he calles them Puritanes which deſire to haue the Church thorowly reformed, there is no ſuch diſſention betweene them, but that they all agree in the Articles of Faith, maintayne brotherly concorde one with an other, notwithſtanding in diuerſitie of opinions concerning the matters and manner of reformation. But what an impudent attempte is chaunge of Religion, hee will ſhewe vs out of Luther, which writing againſte the Anabaptiſtes Anno 1528. affirmeth that much Chriſtianitie, and true Chriſtianitie is vnder the Popedome. If chaunge of Religion bee ſo impudent an attempte, why were the Papiſtes finding Religion quietly eſtablyſhed by lawe, ſo impudent in Queene Maryes time, not only to attempte but alſo to bring to paſſe in deede an alteration

ration of Religion. But the Popish Religion was true Christianitie by Luthers confession. I aunswere, Luther did meane nothing lesse by that confession, then to defende any parte of Popery to bee Christianitie, but writinge against the Anabaptistes which woulde haue all thinges abolyshed which the Papistes vsed, he sheweth that such partes and Articles of Christianitie, which in generall confession and acknowledging of the authoritie of the Scriptures, the Papistes haue common with vs, are not therefore to bee reiected, because of them they haue bene abused. Otherwise it is a poore Moriue vnto Popery, that Luther by these or any other woordes did euer minister vnto you.

The 17. Motiue is the 11. Demaunde.

The Catholike faith in England mightely planted & lightly changed. S. Augustine the Apostle of Englishmen of what Religion and authoritie. Miracles for our whole Religion. Sainte Bede of our Religion. His story to be read of Englishmen. Images and Crosses confirmed by miracle. Prophecyes and visions for our Religion. Bristow.

The Catholike Faith was purely planted in this Iland by the Apostles euen in the raigne of Tiberius, as testifieth Gildas, sixe hundreth yeeres before Augustine came from Rome, bringing in deede with him the principall groundes of Christianitie, and with all, much Monkish superstition. But that the Religion of Papistrie differeth in as many pointes from that which Augustine planted, as Augustines doth from oures, I haue prooued abundantly, in aunsweare to Stapletons Fortresse, and breefely in the Table of differences. And in such poyntes wherein wee differ from Augustine, I haue proued that Augustine differed from Fulke.

from the Apoſtles. As for his Miracles affirmed by the Saxons, and denied by the Briton writers, ſhall ſtill remaine in controuerſie for me. As alſo his prophecie ſo tearmed by the Saxons, which the Britons affirme to be a threatening of crueltie, which he himſelfe procured to be executed on the poore Students & clergie of Bangor.

In the demaunde, Briſtow would knowe of vs whether the Britains by Eleutherius were cõuerted to one faith, and the Saxons by Gregory and Auguſtine vnto an other. But I haue ſhewed before that the Britanes were not cõuerted by Elutherius, although perhaps the Church, which was more then an hundreth yeares of age in his tyme, might by him of charitie be confirmed in truth, or admoniſhed to beware of ſuch heretikes as then troubled the Church abroade. But I deny that Eleutherius maynteyned all that ſuperſtition, which Auguſtine brought in. And I affirme that ỹ Britons church in Auguſtines tyme, differed in more things then in the celebration of Eaſter, from the Romiſh Churche, as I haue ſhewed in that confutation of Stapleton, euen by teſtimony of Bede him ſelfe: Although I will not deny, but there might be ſome corruption euen amonge the Britayns alſo, as there were that maynteyned the hereſie of the Pelagians. Wherefore into that Catholike faith, which was firſt mightely planted in this lande by the Apoſtles of Chriſt, and not of Gregorie, through the moſt weightie argumentes taken of the auctority of the holy Scriptures, is this realme by the great mercie of God, returned, from the ſchiſme and hereſie of Antichriſt, & ſo I hope ſhall remaine, euen vntil the ſecond comming of Chriſt.

The 18. *motiue is the* 3. *demaund.*

Briſtow. *Going out. S. Optatus motiue. The churches practiſe is alwayes infallible. The vnitie and conſtancie of the Biſhops of England. Proteſtants doe decay and ſhall come to nothing.*

We

We like Optatus Motiue well, for going out of the Church into any other faction. But it may not be drawn contrarie to his meaning against those which goe out of Babilon into Ierusalem. He saith, *We must see who hath remained in the roote with the whole worlde.* Verely not the Papists, which are departed from the doctrine of the Apostles which is the roote of the Church, by them planted in all the worlde. *We must see who is gone foorth.* which Bristow doth rightly referre to that saying of Saint Paule. *Discedent quidam à fide,* Some shall departe from the Fayth. But who are those? They that teache the doctrine of deuilles, forbidding to marrye and commaunding to abstaine from meates. Nowe whether Papists or protestants be such, let the worlde iudge. Optatus will haue it farther considered, *Who is set in an other Chayre that was not before?* Verely none so manifestly as the Pope, who sitteth in a Chayre, that none of the Apostles, nor Apostolike men, for many hundreth yeeres after Christe did knowe. Fulke.

Againe, *Who hath sette an Aultar against the Aultar?* who but the Papists, which haue erected the Sacrifice of the Masse, to ouerthrow the Aultar of the crosse of Christ? Finally, *Who hath made an ordination, the other before ordayned, beeing whole & sounde. Quis ordinationem fecerit saluo altero ordinato.* Which Bristow hath falsely trãslated thus. *Who hath placed Bishops there, where others were placed before which are yet aline.* As though it were a faulte, to putte out false Bishoppes, and to supply the roomes with true Bishoppes, where as Optatus meaneth of Heretikes, which are gone from true Byshoppes, aud sette vppe Heretikes in schisme, the true Bishoppes still remayning as the Papistes did in Queene Maryes time, vntyll they had burned vppe almoste all.

As for the vnitie and constancy of the popishe deposed Prelates, which hee commendeth, is sufficiently knowne to the worlde, which although they were all saue one obstinate in the beginning of her Maiesties

raygne, becauſe they hoped by trayterous practiſes, fooliſh prophecies, & deuiliſh coniuration, to ſee an alteration ſhortly, aſwel for religion, as alſo for the whole ſtate of the common wealth, and withall had experience of the mercifulnes and compaſſion of the Kinges of Iſraell, ſo that they were not in feare of their liues, or any great hazard of their goods, yet had they all or the moſt part of them (ſuch was their good conſtancy) reuolted from popery, and ſworne againſt the Pope, in the raygne of Kinge Henrye and King Edward. As for the decaye of Proteſtants and profeſſors of the truthe of Gods word, which the cold prophet foreſeeth, by ſome trayterous deuiſe, whiſpered among his pewfellowes at Louayne or Dowaye, it ſhall haue ſuch ſucceſſe and euent by Gods grace, as hitherto the like treaſonable practiſes haue obteyned, whiche alwayes, (Gods holy name be prayſed therefore) hath turned to the confuſion of Popery and the further ſpreading of the light of the Goſpell.

In the demaunde, he vrgeth vs to ſhewe *when the Romanes went out of the truth, forſaking any company of Chriſtians then liuing*. This hath bene often ſhewed, that the Romanes though not all at once, yet by litle and litle, euen as the myſterie of iniquitie got ſtrength, which began to worke in the Apoſtles tyme, haue departed from the communion of other Chriſtians. The firſt ſtorye that maketh notable mention, is *Euſeb. lib. 5. cap. 25.* of Victor which did cut him ſelfe from all the Churches of the Eaſt about a ceremonye, ſince which tyme, the Romane Biſhops, by litle and litle, haue departed vntill they made a generall apoſtaſie and defection, from the vniuerſall Churche, condemning all the Chriſtians in the world, except ſuch as held of their particular ſchiſmaticall and hereticall Churche of Rome.

The 19. motiue is the 4. demaund.

Riſing

Riſinge afterwarde. Sayns Ireneus and Tertullians motiue. Briſtow.

He ſpendeth muche labour in vayne, to proue that the firſt religion is the onely true religion, and that all ſectes that ariſe after, are falſe, which we graunt moſt willingly with Irenæus, Tertullian, and the Scripture it ſelfe. But he hath not one worde to proue, that our religion is of a later ſpringe, then the Apoſtles, and therefore like an aſſe, he flyeth to their common ſtable, ſaying that Luther liued but yeſterdaye, as though Luther were the firſte author of our religion. Which if it be not as auncient as Chriſt and the Apoſtles, might eaſiely be confuted by the doctrine of Chriſt and the Apoſtles, contayned in the holye Scriptures. Fulke.

The 20. motiue is the 5. demaunde.

Beginninge with wondringe and gayneſaying of Chriſtians then in vnitye, vvhich is Sayntt Irenæus motiue. Briſtow.

Our religion of Chriſt reuealed in the fleſhe, began with wondring and gayneſaying of Scribes, & Phariſees, as it is manifeſt by the hiſtorye of the Goſpell, *Marke* 1. yet was not the doctrine of Chriſt newe or ſtraunge, but newely begonne to be reſtored, which was by them corrupted, ſo is the ſame now wondred at, and gayneſayde by their ſucceſſors, the Papiſtes, but of true Chriſtians it is nether wondred at, nor gayneſayde, contrariwiſe the hereſie of Papiſtes, in manye poyntes was wondred at and gayneſayde by true Chriſtians, whiche Briſtowe ſaythe, we can not proue to be in anye one. For example, I will name one of the chiefeſt articles which they holde, namely, the Popes ſupremacye, vpon which all the reſt in Fulke.

Euſebius teſtifyeth, that when Victor Biſhoppe of Rome, which was the firſt that challéged any ſupremacie tooke vpon him to excommunicate the Churches aud Biſhops of Aſia, about the celebration of Eaſter: His preſumption was wondred at and gainesayde, not only by thoſe Churches and their Biſhops, but euen by others neere hand, as by Irenæus Biſhop of Lyons in Fraunce, which ſharpely reproued him therfore, more thé two huudreth yeeres after, when Zozimus & other Romiſh Prelates made claime to a kind of ſupremacy, in reſiſting appeale out of Africa, and for that purpoſe, had counterfaited a decree of the Nicene councel: They were wondred at and gainesaid by the whole councell of Carthage. The like might I ſhewe, for worſhipying of Images, the reall preſence tranſubſtatiation &c. But where hee ſayeth thar all hereſies were wondered at and gainesaide, immediatly after they aroſe, it cannot be proued. Nor that all was Hereſie that was gainesaide by them that were in vnitie.

For the baptiſme of Heretikes was gainesaide by Sainćte Cyprian and all the Biſhoppes of Africa, yet was it none hereſie, that Infants might be ſaued with out receiuing of the communion, was gainesaid by Innocentius Biſhop of Rome, and by S. Anguſtine and by all the church, that was at vnitie againſt the Pelagians. *Auguſt. contra duas epiſtolas Pelag. ad Bonifacium. lib. 2. Cap 4.* Yet was not that opinion then helde by the Pelagians otherwiſe horrible Heretikes and hereſie, but that which the Biſhop of Roms & the reſt of the known viſible church did holde, was an error, whereby you may ſee, how truely the commaundement of Chriſte vnto Peter, to confirme his Brethren after his conuerſion doth giue the Byſhop of Rome' power never to be deceiued. nor to fall into error. And that the Church may be the piller and ſtay of trueth, although the chiefe members thereof, and generally all that are knowen to be members thereof may be taken in ſome particular error.

The

The 21. Motiue is the 42. demaunde.

Vnſent. Orders. Proteſtants allowe better of our orders thē of their owne. *Briſtow.*

Wheras Briſtowe chargeth vs to be vnſent, it is nothing elſe, but a popiſh ſlaunder and petition of principle, for we are called and ſent ordinarily by the Church and elders of the ſame, to preach the word of God and to miniſter the Sacraments. Neither are we ordayned by a lay Prince, as he like a lewde Papiſt doth ſlaunder both our Chriſtian Prince and vs. And although the Prince by letters Patents hath ſent ſome to preach and viſite the Churches of her dominions, yet ſhee hath doone it by authoritie of the worde of God and by example of godly Princes, Ioſaphat and other 2. *Chro.* 17. not taking vpon het to execute any eccleſiaſticall function, but according to her kingly authoritie in cauſes eccleſiaſticall. Fulke.

And where Briſtowe ſaith we allowe better of their popiſh orders, then of our owne, ſeeking as much as we can poſſible, to be conſecrated by one of their orders, except it be ſome ſuch proude hypocrite as Briſtowe is, that ſo iudgeth and ſeeketh, it is a moſte abhominable lye. For withall our heart, wee abhorre, deſie, deteſt and ſpit at your ſtinking greaſie antichriſtian orders. Neither doth our Church receiue any of your execrable, ordering to miniſter in the Church before they haue ſolemnly by othe renounced your Antichriſte, and publikely as well profeſſed to imbrace all true religion, as Proteſted that in their conſcienſes they defy all papiſtry and other hereſies. Although many godly men wiſhe, yet a more ſeuere diſcipline in examining and receiuing ſuch as come out of your hereſie, to ſerue in the Church of God.

The 22. motiue is the 43. demaund.

Brifton. *Succeſſion. S. Optatus motiue. The Church is euerlaſting & viſible. S. Hieroms & S. Auguſtines motiue. the Church euerlaſting. The communion of the B. of Rome, to be kept of all Chriſtians. Succeſſion in the ſee Apoſtolike. Tertullians and Auguſtines motiues.*

Fulke. That the Church is euerlaſting, Briſtow neede not haue take ſuch paynes to proue, & that this continuance is preſerued by ſucceſſion, is alſo to be confeſſed. But ỳ this ſucceſſion is viſible, & limited to any one ſea of biſhops, it is falſe. For euen as he him ſelfe ſayth *it is neceſſary that all Adams children to be come of Adam by a continuall pedegree of fathers and grandfathers and other progenitors, euen vntill his time*, and yet no one of Adams childrē can deduce this pedegree by naming of all his progenitors from Adam vnto his time ſo there is no doubt, but the Church hath had a perpetuall ſucceſſion in the world, from ỳ beginning thereof, vntil this day, although ſhe can not name a particular ſucceſſion of perſons in any one place, for all ages that are paſt. But euen as by the Scriptures we are taught, that Adam is our naturall father, although we can not name all our aūceſtors that haue bene betwene vs and him: right ſo by the Scriptures we are taught, that the Church is our heauenly mother, although we can not frame ſuch tables of ſucceſſion as the Papiſtes require vs to ſhew, which they can not performe them ſelues. For although they can name a number of Biſhops, whereof ſome haue taught at Rome, ſome haue ſitten and ſlept in their chayer at Rome, and ſome at Auynion, ſome haue played the deuill therein, an hundreth of the laſt being no more like to a ſcore of the firſte in doctrine and life, then God, whoſe children the firſt were, is like the deuill whoſe derlings

derlings the laſt were: yet what is this to ſhewe a ſucceſſion of their Church. And howe doth this proue them to be the true Churche: can not the Churche of Conſtantinople and other Churches in Greece, doe the like vnto this daye? Yet doe the Papiſtes count all them for heretikes and ſciſmatikes. Whatſoeuer therefore Optatus, Hierom, Auguſtine, Tertullian, or any other haue written of ſucceſſion of Biſhops in the Apoſtolike ſees, they meane ſo large and ſo farre forth as they continue in ſucceſſion of Apoſtolike doctrine. Otherwiſe woulde not Hierom haue embraced Arrianiſme, becauſe it was receyued by Liberius who ſate in the Apoſtolike ſee of Rome, and coulde name his predeceſſors from Peter. Nor Optatus haue receyued Eutychianiſme, becauſe it was defended by Dioſcorus, which ſatte in the Euangeliſticall ſee of Alexandria, and coulde name his predeceſſors from S. Marke the diſciple of S. Peter. Nether woulde Auguſtine haue conſented to Arrianiſme, becauſe it was mayntayned by Eulalius and Euzoius, Biſhops of the Apoſtolike ſee of Antioche, althoughe they were able to ſhewe their ſucceſſion by many Biſhops, euen vnto S. Peter him ſelfe, who planted his chayer at Antioche, by all Papiſtes confeſſion ſeuen yeares before he came to Rome. You ſee therefore howe farre the motiue of ſucceſſion may drawe or driue any man to haue regard vnto it, euen as long, as there is ſucceſſion of doctrine, as well as of place and perſon, and not longer, nor further.

The 23. motiue is the 44. demaund.

Apoſtolike Church. The Communion of the Biſhop of Rome to be kept of all Chriſtians. Apoſtolike Church is the Romane Church. Apoſtolike Church as the Romane is S. Auguſtines motiue. Succeſſion of the Biſhops of Rome, the motiue of Optatus, S. Auguſtine and S. Irenæus. Briſtow.

This motiue in effect, is all one with the former, and in a maner so confessed by Bristow him selfe. But thus he taketh his principle of their singing in the Masse, & our saying in the communion, of the creede, in which we confesse that we beleue one onely Catholike and Apostolike Church. This one Catholike Church sayth Bristow *is our Church that is Apostolike, because it agreeth with the faith of the Church of Rome, which is the sea of an Apostle, holding on to this day by succession, and to which was written an Epistle by an Apostle.* I aunswer, it is not the popish Romane Church, because that Church is departed from the vniuersal Church of Christ, planted by the Apostles through out the worlde, and holdeth not on in succession of the doctrine of the Apostle, which did write that epistle to the Romanes. But Bristowes wise reasoning, is to be noted. *S. Peter was an Apostle.* That is true. *he was the first Bishop of Rome.* It is a great doubt, whether he euer came at Rome, and it is out of doubt by the Scriptures, that he tarried not there so longe as the histories affirme, and last it is false that he was a Bishop of a particular Church, which was an Apostle ouer all the world, and specially ouer the circumcision. *There is a citye in the worlde named Rome.* And that citye by the Scripture is the seat of Antichrist and the whore of Babylon. *Apoc. 17. vers. 18. S. Paules epistle to the Romaines is extant.* and euen that epistle will proue the Church of Rome at this day, to be not apostolicall but apostatical, as in many articles, so in the article of iustification. *Rom. 3. vers. 28. Are not those causes why a Church is called Apostolike,* sayth Bristow? No verily but onely because it holdeth and mayntayneth the Apostolike doctrine, which if it doe in all necessary articles, then is it Apostolike, & hath succession and plantation of the Apostles, or els not, although it be gathered in such cities in which the Apostles haue preached, planted, and to whome they haue written. But Tertullian doth so define Apostolike Churches, sayth Bristow. I say it is vntrue, for Tertullian against newe heretikes, sendeth vs not to the emptye chayres

chayres of the Apoſtles, which had written to ſuch cities, but vnto the the teſtimony of their doctrine, receyued from the Apoſtles, and continued vntill that time.

So he ſendeth them that are in Achaia, to Corinthe. ſuch as are in Macedonia to Philippi, thoſe that are in Aſia to Epheſus, & them which be neare Italy to Rome, from whence they of Africa had their authoritie, not by excellency of that Church aboue other Apoſtolike Churches, but by nearenes of place: Therfore he ſaith, *Proxima eſt tibi Achaia? habes Corinthum. Si non longè es à Macedonia, habes Philippos. Si potes in Aſiam tendere, habes Epheſum, ſi autem Italiæ adieceris, habes Romam, vnde nobis quæq; auctoritas preſto eſt ſtatua.* Is Achaia neareſt vnto thee? thou haſt Corinthe. If thou be not farre from Macedonia, thou haſt Philippi. If thou canſt goe into Aſia, thou haſt Epheſus. If thou lye neare to Italy, thou haſt the Church of Rome from whence vnto vs alſo (in Africa) authoritie is ſetled nearer at hand. *Tertul. de præſcr.* But Briſtow ſayth that the auncient fathers *when there were many Apoſtolike Churches ſtanding, they did principally and ſingularly direct men alwayes to the Church of Rome.* This you ſee to be falſe, by the place of Tertullian laſt cited. But that they did more often direct men to the teſtimony of the Church of Rome, it was for that by meanes of the Imperiall citie, it was more notorious and beſt knowne. Otherwiſe it is a very lye of Briſtow, where he ſayth, that when the fathers name the Apoſtolike church, they do meane the Romane church by excellency, as the Poet ſignifieth Vergil and the Philoſopher Ariſtotle. A like lye it is, that no Church remayneth in the world founded by any of the Apoſtles, but onely Rome. For many Churches remayne to this day, that were planted by the Apoſtle Paule, who from Hieruſalem to Illyricum filled all the contryes with the doctrine of the Goſpell: of which many vnto this day continue in profeſſion of Chriſtianitie, beſide all the Churches of India & AEthiopia, which were alſo planted by the Apoſtles Thomas and other. The more bea-

ſtly is the blundering of this Briſtow, who dreameth, that the councell of Conſtantinople the 1. which made this confeſſion by the Apoſtolike Church, *did not only meane the Romane Church, but alſo none other but the Romane Church.*

As though that councell could not diſtinguiſh the Catholike Apoſtolike Church, diſperſed ouer all ỹ face of the earth, from the particular Apoſtolike Church of Rome, which was but a member thereof: when the ſame councel gaue the like priuiledges of honor to the Church of Conſtantinople, which the Church of Rome had, reſeruing but the ſenioritie to ỹ Church of Rome. And being called to a councel at Rome by the Princes letters, procured by Damaſus Biſhop of Rome, & other Biſhops of Italy & the Weſt, they refuſed to come, as hauing already by the Emperour of the Eaſt being gathered to Conſtantinople, concluded what they thought good to be decreed, *Hiſtor. trip. lib. 9, cap. 13.* And in their epiſtle written to their fellow miniſters Damaſus, Ambroſe &c. gathered in councell at Rome, wherein they excuſed their refuſall to come, they call the Church of Antiochia, *ſenioremꝝ vere apoſtolicam Eccleſiam*, the elder, & truly an Apoſtolike Church. The church of Ieruſalem they call the mother of all Churches. *Ep. Concil. Conſtanti. Hiſt. trip. lib. 9. cap. 14.* Nether was it euer in their mind, to make the particular Church of Rome, the only Apoſtolike Church of the world, but onely a principall member conſenting with the ſame. The ſucceſſion of biſhops of Rome alledged by Irenæus, Tertullian, Auguſtine, Optatus doth nothing in the world defend the popiſh biſhops in their ſucceſſiō vnto this day, for ſo much as they ſucceede not in doctrine, as well as in place. Nether doe we make any leape from Luther vnto the Apoſtles, but prouing our doctrine to be the doctrine of the Apoſtles, we doubt no more of perpetuall ſucceſſion thereof, then knowing our ſelues to be deſcended from Adam, we doubt whether we haue had a lineall diſcent of progenitors vnto this time, that I may vſe Briſtowes owne

owne example, to declare that numbring of Biſhops is no more neceſſary in the one, thē ſhewing our pedegrie in the other. Seing the queſtion is not how many men, & in what places were profeſſed this doctrine, but whether it be the ſame which ỹ Apoſtles taught: but that can not better be proued, then by the writings of ỹ Apoſtles.

The places cited by Briſtow for ſucceſſion out of Irenæus Tertullian Optatus, Auguſtine you ſhall finde anſwered in my confutation of Stapletons fortres *part.* 2. *cap.* 1. & of Sanders rocke *cap.* 15. where alſo is anſwered the place of S. Luke *cap.* 22. of Chriſt praying that Peters faith might not faile.

The 24. motiue is the 45. demaund.

The Romaines neuer chaũged their religion. S. Bede of our religion, the Romaine church his motiue, Proteſtãts be of many old hereſies. The Apoſtles were of our religion. Prayer for the dead vſed alwayes. Briſtow.

If the Romaines had not chaũged their religion ſince their faith was cõmended by the Apoſtle, there ſhould be no controuerſie betwene vs & them. And if Briſtow cã proue by the Apoſtles writing that he is of their religion, or that they were of the Popiſh religiõ the ſtrife is at an ende. How farre Bede was of your religion, I haue ſhewed in the anſwer to Stapletons fortreſſe. But he vrgeth vs to ſhew, *what Pope chaunged their religion, what tumults riſing in the worlde thereon, what Doctors withſtoode it, what coũcels accuſed &c. which he ſaith they can ſhew in all innouatiõs both great & ſmal, that euer by heretikes were attẽpted.* What an impudent lyar is this Briſtow to brag of that, which at this day is impoſſible to be don, by any mã liuing in the worlde. For of ſo many heretikes as are reherſed by Epiphanius & Auguſtine, not the one halfe of thē can be ſo ſhewed as Briſtow like a blind bayard boaſteth they can doe. But if we ſay the chaunge was not made al at once we muſt ſhew whē euery pece was altered, as they do of our doctrin, of old taught by many old Fulke.

heretiks, *AErius denying praier for the dead &c.* Whereof many are slaũders & lyes, the rest if we can not defend by Scriptures let them be take for heresies. To the purpose, we haue often shewed and are ready daily to shew, the beginning of many of their heresies, & errors, as of the Popes supremacy in Victor, of prayer for the dead in the Montanists, of their crossing in the Valentinians, of images in the Gnostikes and Carpocratians, and so of a great many other errors, which are contrary to the holy Scriptures, by which we first reproue them of falshood, and as stories serue vs, we open their beginnings. And wheras Bristow without all shame, affirmeth that prayer for the dead was vsed alwayes, & citeth Irenæus among other for his auctor he sheweth nothing but impudency matched with his heresie, for there is no worde in Ireneus, to proue that prayer for the dead was vsed of any godly man of his time.

Tertullian a Montanist is the first that maketh any mention of prayers for the dead, & only in such bookes as he wrote when he was an heretike. Whereas Augustine sayth *Ep.*119. That ỹ church of God nether approueth, nor keepeth secret, nor doth such thinges as be against the faith, and good maners, it is to be vnderstanded of such things, as the church knoweth to be against the faith. For of some thinges the church may be ignorant, as Augustine confesseth in his retractations *lib.*2. "*cap.*18. *Vbicunq; in his libris commemorauí ecclesiam non habentem maculam aut rugam, non sic accipiendum est, quasi iam sit, sed quæ præparatur vt sit, quando apparebit etiam gloriosa. nunc enim propter quasdam ignorantias & infirmitates membrorum suorum, habet vnde quotidie tota dicat: Dimitte nobis debita nostra.* Whereseouer in those bookes I haue made mention of ỹ church, not hauing spot or wrinckle, it is not to be take, as though she were so now, but which is prepared that she may be when she shall appeare also glorious: For now because of certaine ignorances and infirmities of her members, euen the whole church hath cause to say euerie day, forgiue vs our trespasses.

Notwithstan-

Notwithſtanding the watchmen therefore prophecied by Eſay, continually geuing warning vpon the walles againſt the inuaſion of open enemies, and blaſphemous heretikes, yet many hypocrites haue crept into the church ſecretly, and vnder ſhew of pietie, haue ſhewed many errors and ſuperſtitions, while the myſterie of iniquity wrought the full manifeſtation and Apoſtaſie of Antichriſt. In the demaunde Briſtow denyeth that any Pope did erre, although I haue ſhewed both out of ſtories, S. Hierom, the Pope Damaſus, and the generall councels, the contrarie. But admitting they did erre, yet (ſayth he) they erred not in ſuch matters as the Proteſtantes doe now charge the Pope & Romaines withall. Whereto I anſwer, that againſt that blaſphemous principle of theirs, that the Pope can not erre, we firſt bring in thoſe examples of Popes, that were heretikes & for their time altered religion like heretikes in ſuch matters as we both confeſſe to be errors. Then this being obteyned, that the Pope is not priuiledged from error, the matters in controuerſie wherewith we charge the Pope, are to be examined only by the auctoritie of the holy Scriptures and thereby to be decided.

The 25. motiue is the 9. demaunde.

The converſion of Heathen nations. Calvines Legates in India. The diſcorde of Proteſtantes. Ieſuites Fryers preaching in India. Miracles for our whole religion. The Apoſtles were of our religion. The church is euerlaſting and viſible. Briſtow.

All nations that were at the firſt cõuerted to the true faith of Chriſt were conuerted by the Apoſtles, whoſe faith and doctrine we hold, and will proue by their writings that we holde none other. As for the argument of Fryers preaching in India & miracles wrought ſo fare Fulke.

hence, with such great conuersion of the Indians vnto Popery, if it were true, yet proueth it no more then the preaching and miracles of the false Apostles *Phil.* 1. and the conuersion of the Gothes and Vandalls Crepides &c. by the Arrians and other nations by Nestorius &c. doth proue those false Apostles to be true Apostles, or the heresies of the Arrians &c. to be true doctrine. Wherefore not the Papistes, but the Apostles of Christ, were his witnesses, vnto the vttermost places of the earth. But of this matter of conuersion, and all thinges conteyned, you may reade somewhat more at large in mine aunswere to Stapletons fortresse, where the same is handled. *part.* 1. *cap.* 16. & 17.

The 26. *Motiue is the* 18. 13. *and* 14. *demaund.*

Brifton. *By what religion hath Idolatrie bene destroyed. Prophecies for our religion. Protestantes be possessed with deuills. Churches confirmed by miracles. Deuills expelled by reliques. Deuills are in heretikes. S. Hierome of our religion. The martyrs of our religion. Vigilantius alone againe in Protestants. S. Augustine & Chrysostome of our religion. The honor and vertue of Saintes reliques. S. Augustines motiue for which Christ is to be beleued. Our religion an inuincible motiue to forsake idolls and beleue in Christ, who is to be beleued for the vertue of the signe of his crosse, which working miracles, was the motiue of Lactantius. The reall presence of Christ in the sacrament. The crosse and the masse confirmed by S. Bernard, in Italy. S. Cyprian of our religion. The Iewes religion chaunged into ours by Christ &c.*

Fulke. In this motiue is much babling, but no matter at all. The summe of that he would proue is this. That Popery is not idolatrie, as we charge it because by Popery Idolatrie hath bene destroyed. Although this argument is naught, because one kinde of Idolatrie may destroy an other,

other, yet it is falsely affirmed, that Poperie hath destroyed all idolatry. That Popery hath destroyed idolatry: Bristow wil proue by three examples, the one of the reliques of Saincts, and the honor of them, the other of the signe of the crosse and the honor thereof, and the last by the reall presence in the Sacrament, which he calleth his Lord and his God. But our Lord and God is in heauen according to the Psalm. 115. The destruction of idolatrie by Christ in deede was prophecied therefore the Pope setting vp and mainteyning as grosse idolatrie almost as euer was any of the Paganes, sheweth him selfe to be a verie Antichrist. But to the purpose Hierom *lib. 28. in Isa. cap. 65.* sayth that the heretikes in Fraunce were possessed with the deuill which could not abide the might and whips of the holy ashes. If he spake this against Vigilātius, & other godly men, which reproued the immoderate honoring of reliques and other superstitions, he spake of his owne iudgement, and not of the iudgement of the church. For he only of all writers of his time, counted Vigilantius an heretike as he did Ruffinus also, which yet is take for as good a Catholike as he. It is knowne how he taunteth and scoffeth at Augustine. Wherefore his censure is not sufficient to make Vigilantius opinion heresie, nor them heretikes which were of his iudgemēt. But admit this iudgement of Hierom to be sounde, yet was not the honor and estimation of reliques which he defendeth, against Vigilantius the same, which is in Poperie, but much differing there frō. For thus he writeth *ad Ripanum contr. Vigilant.* *Nos autem non dico martyrum reliquias, sed ne solem quidem & lunam, non Angelos non Archangelos non Cherubin, non Seraphim, & omne nomen quod nominatur & in præsenti sæculo & in futuro colimus & adoramus, ne seruiamus potius creaturæ quā creatori qui est benedictus in sæcula.* But we worship and adore. I say not the reliques of the martyrs, but not the sunne & the moone, not the Angells not Archangels, not Cherubin, not Seraphim, & euery name that is named both in this world, and in the world to come

" leaſt we ſhould ſerue the creature rather then the crea-
" tor which is bleſſed for euer.

By this you may ſee that the honor they gaue to reliques was but a reuerent eſtimatiō of them, for Chriſts ſake, whoſe ſeruaunts the Martyrs were, and a leſſe honor then they gaue to the Sunne and the Moone, as is manifeſt by his gradation, and conſequently no religious worſhip. As the Papiſtes vſe and mayntayne of the reliques, not of Sayncte, but oftentymes of deuills incarnate, of beaſts and all manner of fayned bables. Nether is there any thing more monſtrous in popery, then their ſhameles fayning of infinite reliques. That Auguſtine writeth that deuils were tormented and expelled, at the memories or burialls of the martyrs, where ſomtimes idolls were worſhipped, it proueth that idols were deſtroyed by Poperie. For if God wrought miracles at ſuch places, where the bodies of his Martyrs ſlept to cōfirme the faith, for which they died, doth this make any thing for Popery? But the ſame Auguſtine to the Maudaurenſes that were Pagans, and other heathen men vſeth the argument of the greater honor aud reuerence doone by Kings and Emperours at the tombes and memories of the Saintes and Martyrs, and of miracles wrought at the ſame places, to ſhew the power of Chriſte to the confuſion of idolatrie. This wee graunt, but how doth Popery ouerthrowe Idolatrie? There reuerence although in ſōe reſpects ſuperſtitious, was far from popiſh Idolatrie, of worſhipping of Saints, Images, bones, &c, as wee haue ſhewed euen now out of Hierom the moſt eger defender of thoſe vſes and abuſes in his time: The miracles approued none other doctrine, then the martyrs died for, who died for none other doctrine, but ſuch as is contayned in the holy Scriptures, in which Poperie hath no ground. The like I ſay of the ſtorie of the bodie of Babycas the martyr, in preſence wherof, the oracle of Apollo could not ſpeake. But Chryſoſtom *to draw men from all kind of idolatrie, ſent them from reliques.* In *Gen. Hom.* 15, Nay he ſent them to

the

the churches and houſes of prayer, & to the graues of the martyrs not to worſhip them, as Papiſtes doe, but by ſuch things to receaue bleſſing and to kepe them ſelues from being entãgled with the ſnares of the deuill, while they be put in mind of the vertue of the martyrs, to follow their godly cõuerſation. And albeit there were ſome ſuperſtitiõ in that regard of martyrs troubles & memories, as in that age there was, yet doth it not follow, there was all Popery, nor ſuch groſſe idolatry as Papiſtes doe commit with their counterfait relques. Finally the miracles wroght by God at the dead bodies of the Saincts, might wel be vſed by Auguſtin, Chryſoſtom, & Theodoret againſt the Gẽtills, as an argumẽt to ouerthrow their idolatrie, euen as the example of the miracles wrought by God at the dead body of Elizeus againſt the idolatrous Iſraelits *Reg.* but it followeth not therof, that idols ſhould be made of their lawes, by worſhipping them as the Papiſts do. For ỹ bones of Elizeus were not for that miracle takẽ out of his graue & ſhined in gold, deuided into many churches worſhiped, licked, and kiſſed, as the Popiſh guiſe is. The ſame aunſwere I make concerning miracles wrought by God with the ſigne of the croſſe, which was the motiue of Lactantius. I ſay they proue not that the ſigne of the croſſe ſhould be worſhipped, no more then the miracles wrought by God, with the braſen ſerpẽt, were any cauſe why the Iſraelits ſhould worſhip the braſen ſerpent. *Reg.*

And as touching the bleſſed Sacrament, which Briſtow blaſphemouſly calleth his Lord and God, although the reall preſence and tranſſubſtantiation were graunted, foraſmuch as the Papiſts thẽ ſelues affirme the Sacrament to conſiſt of accidents as the ſigne, but no accidẽts are God or in God: If any miracles were wrought by God at the celebration therof, as Auguſtine and Cyprian ſeeme to auouch, yet neither is the reall preſence proued by thoſe miracles, nor they tryed to be Papiſts, for writing of ſuch miracles, of which if any man will ſee more, let him reſorte to mine aunſwere vnto Heſ-

kins *lib.* 1. *cap.* 24. *& lib.* 3. *cap.* 42.

Vnto the storie of S. Bernards life we geue no credit, as to a counterfait fable, and as litle to the reporte of M. Poynts, in his booke of the real presence testifying the casting out of many deuils, by vertue of the same sacrament. Finally it is altogeather false, that he sayeth, the Iewes religion was chaynged by Christ into Popery. For the sacrifice of Christes death, against which the sacrifice of the Popish masse is blasphemous, hath taken away all sacrifices & ceremonies of the law. *Heb.* 9. Concerning the Altar which Christians haue, whereof they haue no power to eate which serue the Tabernacle, *Heb.* 13. mine aunswere is against Heskins. *lib.* 3. *cap.* 60. where that text & argument is handeled of purpose.

The 27. motiue is the 35. demaund.

Bristow. *Vnity of the church a motiue to beleue in Christ. The discord of Protestantes, the inconstancy of Protestantes.*

Fulke. Our Sauiour Christ praieth that his disciples may be one in God & him theyr redeemer. And this vnitye all Protestantes retaine, notwithstanding diuersity of opinion in one article, & any contention about ceremonies. Euen as the Apostles were one, in one God and Christ, although there was variaunce about Circumcision & ceremonies. Ciprian & Cornelius, the Romayne church & the church of Carthage, were at vnitye in Christ, although the one of them erred in the sacramēt of baptisme. So were Hierome, & Augustine, although they mayneteyned contrary opinions about Peters dissembling & translation of the Scripture. From this verily I except such schismaties, as delight in contencion, which haue allwayes bene against the true churh. As for the vnity of the Papistes, seeing it is not in the doctrine of Christ, it proueth no more, that they are those for whom

whom Christ prayed, then the vnity of the Mahometistes which for these thousand yeares, haue kept greater vnity then the Papists, whose church hath bene rent a sunder into so many heades as there haue bene Popes at once, and that very often and for many yeares together there haue bene Pope against Pope, coũcel against coũcell, Doctors against Doctors, orders against orders, Canonists against Diuines, disſéting in articles of faith, as of the Popes supremacy, of original sinne, of transubstantiation &c. Wherefore Christian vnity, is as vntruly denyed vnto vs, as falsely challenged vnto them whatsoeuer he prateth of Lutherans, Zwinglians, Caluinists, Protestants and Puritans.

The 28. and 29. motiues are conteined in the 34. demaund.

Iudges infallible in cases of controuersie. The churches iudgemẽt is alwayes infallible. Obedience of Catholiks to their superiors both ecclesiastical and temporall. Trinitaries. Bristow.

Bristrow braggeth that their church hath iudges infallible in cases of controuersie, and ours hath not. But who be their iudges? The Pope or the generall councell? Whether soeuer of these be, nether is irrefragable. For both haue bene controlled and found fault withall, as I haue shewed before, and they them selues are together by the eares, whether of these is irrefragable, because the councell hath deposed the Pope, & the Pope hath not obeyed the councell, as it is manifest betwene Eugenius the 4. and the councell of Basil. How infallible the churches iudgement is and alwayes hath bene, it serueth not the Romish synagogue, vntill she proue her doctrine to be agreable to the Scriptures, which seeing she neither can doe, nor dare abyde the triall of them, she sheweth plainly, that she is not the church of Christ. As for the auctoritie of synodes such as that of the Apostles was, which determined the controuersy Fulke.

by auctority of the holy Scriptures, Protestãts do gladly acknowledge, how necessary it is for the church to decide controuersies and do willingly submit them selues thereto. The subiection of Papists to their iudges, doth no more proue their religion to be true, then the obedience of the Mahometistes to their superiors, both in cases of religion, and of the common wealth, doth iustifie their sect to be the religion of God. What Trinitaries & other sectaries be in Polonia, or elswhere, that wil not submit themselues to any auctority, as they are no parte of our church, so we haue no cause to excuse or defende them. In the demaunde, Bristow complaineth of an vnlearned Christian, which hath bene suffered to write a vaine libell against the auctority of the church of God, which is a vaine lye, for there is no true Christian learned or vnlearned, which will hold against the church of God, so lõg as she is directed by the word of God, as the true church is in all matters necessarie vnto saluation. But perhaps the vnlearned Christian hath challenged the church of Rome to approue her doctrine by auctority of Gods word. Which because the Papists dare not attẽpt, Bristow requireth I can not tel what approbation & priuiledge of the sayd libell, to shew a bad shift better then none at all, why they wil not answere it. For Popish libells that are but cast abroad in writing, we require no approbation nor priuiledge, & dare not the Papists confute a printed libell before it haue approbation & priuiledge?

The 29. motiue.

Bristow. *Protestantes them selues take thinges vpon our churches credit. The churches auctority. S. Augustines motiue. What Scripture the Protestants deny.*

Fulke. Although we did receaue such things, as he reherseth vpon their churches credit, it followeth not, that theirs is the true church, for we receaue nothing from them, without dew examination. The Scriptures we receaue not,

not, vpon the only credit of the Popish church, but vpon the credit of ỹ vniuersall church of Christ. The creedes, articles of doctrine, tearmes of person trinitie, consubstantiality, Sacraments &c. we receaue, becaus they be consonant to the Scriptures, & not becaus the church of Rome telleth vs they be true. As for the auctoritie of the church, which he sayth was S. Augustines motiue, to beleue the Gospell, was not a single or sole motiue, but a commotiue or an argument that with other arguméts did moue him, for he sayth not *moueret* but *commoueret:* and so it is with vs. Prouided alwayes that the Popish church be no taken for that Catholike or vniuersall church. *VVhat then* (sayth Bristow) *was it the Protestants church whereof Augustine ment? or can you hold laughter when the question is asked?* No verily, for when the Protestants church, that it is now so called in this age, like as it was called the Homousians church in Augustines time, is a member of the Catholike vniuersall church of Christ, and so proued by the holy Scriptures, it is a ridiculous thing to doubt whether it were the popish church which is but an hereticall assembly, departed from the vniuersall church long since Augustines departure out of this life. But Bristow will proue, that the church at whose commanndement Augustine beleued the Gospell, was not the Protestãts church, becaus that church commaunded him to beleue the bookes of Toby, Iudith. VVisdome, Ecclesiasticus, & the Machabees to be canonicall scripture, which the church of Protestantes doth denye. But what if Augustine were deceiued? to thinke he hearde the voice of the Catholike church when he did not, shall the Protestantes churche be condemned? S. Hierome who if the church of Rome were the Catholike church, was more like to heare her voice, becaus he was a Priest of the church of Rome, telleth vs a cleane contrary tale. For thus he writeth,

In præfat. in Prouerbia. Sicus ergo Iudith, & Tobiæ, & Machabæorum libros legit quidem ecclesia, sed eos inter Canonicas scripturas non recipit: sic & hæc duo volumina legat

" *ad ædificationem plebis, non ad auctoritatem ecclesiasticorum dogmatum confirmandam.* Therfore as the Church " in deade readeth the bookes of Iudith and Tobias and " of the Macchabees, but yet she receiueth them not a- " mong the Canonicall scriptures, so she may reade these " two Bookes (speaking of the booke of Wisedome, and " Ecclesiasticus) for the edifying of the common people, " but not for confirming the authoritie of Ecclesiasticall " doctrine. Doth the Church of Protestants iudge other- wise of these Bookes, then that Church which thus in- structed Hierome? What then? I must say as Bristowe doth, S. Hierome and the Catholike Church in his time of our Religion. The Church of Rome now is of an other iudgement, then the Church of Rome was then, ergo it is not now that it was then. But whereas Bristowe chargeth vs to to deny, or at least to leaue in- different the Canticles of Salomon. The Epistle to the Hebrues, The Epistles of Saint Iames, S Peter, S. Iohn, Sainct Iude, with the Apocalips, it is a diueliſh slaunder, as God knoweth and the world can beare vs witnesse.

The 30. Motiue is the 36. and 37. demaũd.

Storehouse of the Scriptures. The Iewes Religion chaunged into ours by Christ. The Churches learning and wisdome. The Church store. S. Irenæus motiue.

Bristowe,

Fulke.

Bristowe demaundeth whether the Popish Church receiuing the Scriptures of the olde and newe Testa- ment from Christ, hath not kept them faithfully with- out adding, minishing, or corrupting. I aunswere no, for the Popish church receiueth none of Christ, but the catholike church of Christ. Againe the popish Church hath added whole bokes to the canon which the chuch of the Iewes neuer receiued, nor the vniuersall Church of Christ. But those Bokes (saith Bristow) hath the Pro- testants church robbed vs of, w̃ are allowed by appro- ued Councels. You heard in the last motiue Hieromes iudge-

iudgement of those bookes, whervnto agreeth the cou-cel of Laodicea cap. 59. Augustine receiueth the boks of Macchabees but with condition of sobrietie in the reader or hearer. *Aug: con. sec. epist. Gaudent. cap.* 13. Last of al the popish church, either of fraud or negligence, hath corrupted an exceeding great number of textes of the scripture in her vulgar latine translation, wshe receueth as only authentical. The very first promise of the gospel is corrupted and falsyfied. For wheras the trueth is *Ipsum conteret caput tuum*, the same seede shall broose thine head, the popish translation hath *Ipsa* the same woman. *Gen* 3. Wheras he saith, the Protestants church for this 100. yeeres (as we cõfesse our selues) occupyed no bible, nor had any thing to do with the scriptures, he lieth out of al measure, for the church of Christ hath alwaies had the scriptures, & in euery nation where it was, it had thẽ in their mother toung. How many Bibles are yet extant written in parchmẽt. 3 or 4. hundreth yeeres past in the English toung, beside other in the Saxon language. The like are to be proued to haue ben in al places where the Churches were gathered as in France, Italy, Bohemia. &c. Finally, whatsoeuer he bableth of their Church to be the store house of the Scriptures & trueth, the like may be said of the greke Church which they cõdemne as schismaticall & hereticall, therefore this storehouse is no Motiue, to proue the Romish Sinagogue to be the church of God. In the 37. demaund he asketh whether as wel Protestants as other, doe not condemne the old writers errors & other heresies of Heretiks which made great shew of scriptures by the rule of ỹ popish churchs faith. I answere, the Protestants out of the scriptures, do & can disproue such shew of scriptures made by maisters of error, & are no more moued by the popish churches authoritie, then the Apostles were moued by authoritie of the Iewish Synagogue, to reproue all the grosse Idolatrie and superstition of the Gentiles. Therfore the popish Church is not *Depositorium Dines*, that rich storehouse of trueth, which was S. Irenęus motiue.

Sending and teaching of all diuine truth. Caluins errors about the trinitie. The ignoraunce of Proteſtants. Such was Iewels ignoraunce alſo, that Chriſte is a prieſte according to his Godhead. Vniuerſities of Heretiks, & Catholikes. Degrees taken in Vniuerſities of Heretiks are ad nihillated. The ignorance of Proteſtants, the cauſe partely why there be ſo many Atheiſtes in England. The Churches learning, wiſdome, and continuance. S. Auguſtines Motiue.

Briſtow.

This Motiue conteineth nothing but an immoderate arrogant bragge of their ſtudying and teaching of trueth, with the great learning of their Doctors and Vniuerſities: and a proude diſdainefull vpbraiding of our Doctors and vniuerſities, of much ignorance and lacke of learning. Which compariſon if it had beene vttered by a man of excellent learning, had beene the leſſe odious, but beeing made by ſuch a blinde Baiarde and blockheadded aſſe, as is this Briſtowe, it is moſte intollerable. Caluiue (ſaith he) through ignoraunce, erred about the Trinitie, ſaying, *That Gods Sonne is αὐτοθεὸς that is God of him ſelfe, whereby it followeth inewitably that there be two Gods.* For this ſlaunderous and fooliſh cauill, he citeth *Inſtitut. lib. 1. cap. 13. Num. 23. &c.* where is no ſuch word nor matter, but a confutation of Heretikes, that denyed the very eſſens of the deitie of Chriſt, he cyteth alſo *Geneb. de trinit. lib. 1. pa. 43.* Where if the woorde αὐτοθεὸς be vſed, as I know not whether it be, yet vndoutedly no ſuch thing is ment thereby as Briſtow bableth. For αὐτοθεὸς maye ſignifie him that is very God himſelfe, although begotten of God the father, euẽ as Gregory Nazianzene in his Booke of the holy Ghoſt, or *De theologia lib. 5.* calleth the holy Ghoſt αὐτοκύριον the Lorde himſelfe, whereof it followeth not that there be two or three Lords, or that the holy ghoſt proceedeth not from the father and the ſonne. Likewiſe he calleth him αὐτοφῶς καὶ ζωήν. Light it ſelfe and Life: that is very light and very life, and yet he denyeth not

Fulke.

that

that he is light, proceeding from light. Wherefore this is an vnlearned cauil againſt Caluine, who more ſoūdly, ſubſtantially & learnedly hath written of the bleſſed trinitie, then all the Dunces, Aquines, Alberts, & the whole rablement of Scholemen, of whome Briſtow ſo vainely doth brag, were euer able to attaine vnto, who with their ſophiſtrie and barbarouſnes haue rather darkened, then ſette foorth the cleere light of thoſe moſt excellent and diuine miſteries. The like impudent cauil, he bringeth againſt M. Iewel, whome no man I think without laughter can read, to be charged with ignorāce by blūdering Briſtow, for affirmiug Chriſt to be a prieſte according to his deitie, whōe the Apoſtle expreſly ſaith, by his eternall ſpirit to haue offred himſelf. *Heb. 9. ve. 11.* As for the compariſons betweene the Vniuerſities of Papiſtes and ours, how vaine it is, all that be learned & of indifferent iudgement can teſtifie. And concerning degrees and ciuil titles of dignitie taken in our vniuerſities, beeing nothing elſe but teſtimonies of their learning which receiue them, we think them better beeing confirmed by the Princes authoritie, from whom all ciuil dignities euen by ciuil law are deriued, then ſuch as are either giuen or confirmed by the Popes leaden Bulles. The Atheiſts & other vnreligious mindes in England, are not nouriſhed by the ignorance of the Proteſtants, but deteſted by their godly and learned iudgement. But if where there be moſt Atheiſts there is greateſt ignorance, then euen in Italy & at Rome vnder the Popes noſe, where be moſt Atheiſts of any regiō almoſt in the world, is greateſt ignorance. Where open blaſphemies are as common, yea oftentimes in the Popes mouth, as the praiſes of God are among true Chriſtians. What trauelle in Italy is ignorant of this, whether he be proteſtant, Papiſt, or Newter. Laſt of all, if the Churches wiſdome, learning, & continuance, was S. Auguſtines motiue, the folly, barbarouſnes, & late ſhining of the popiſh Church, is a motiue to make vs think that it is not the church of Chriſt. For Briſtowes brags are not ſufficient

to carry away all credit of learning to popish doctors & Vniuersities, whose orders and readings he doth the rather commend to be so excellent, that men ẅ knew him of late, with periury to haue taken degrees in Philosophie, should not meruaile that he is so sudenly transformed into so great a doctor of diuinitie, euē by once hearing the cause of Diuinitie, which he supposeth none of our doctors knoweth what it meaneth, such a goodly matter is φιλαυτία whereby a manne maketh moste account of that he hath learned last. But albeit the question be not of learning but of trueth, yet if it would please the Papists to try the learning of our doctors & Vniuersities, vnder indifferent iudges, I doubt not but they should be found equall vnto theirs, that I say not in many things they should be found superiour.

The 32. motiue is the 22. demaund.

Bristowe *Annuall celebrating of Christes mysteries. The churches seruice is to be imbraced. Christ is to be beleued for the scriptures of the olde testamēt as they be vnderstood in the church. Ember daies or Emper dayes, which your blinde Apostles doe boldely say to haue ben the Popes leman. The Martirs were of our religion. Saints dayes laide downe by protestants as our Ladyes daies, S. Laurence day, the assumption of our Lady. The Churches and seruice of heretikes to be refrained in paine of damnation. Against communicating with them. An admonition to priestes that say the new seruice. Heretikes are idolaters, and heresies are idols. The yeare of Iubely 1575. Pilgrimage. The sermons of Heretikes not to be heard, their bookes not to be read. Christ to be beleeued for the vertue of the signe of his Crosse, which worketh miracles. Visions for our religion.*

Fulke. The Annuall celebration of Christes misteries, by dumb ceremonies and readings not vnderstood of the ignorant people, although there were no heresie in the popish seruice nor no sufficient motiues to imbrace the popish synagogue as the church of Christ, if the Scriptures and the figures of the lawe, better applyed, then they

they be in all the lumpe of the popiſh ſolemnities, they would procure ſmall credit to our Sauiour Chriſt: but rather the ſcorning and deriſion of Turkes, Iewes, and Pagans. As for the blind commẽtaries of the Iewes, out of which he imagineth we haue all our vnderſtanding of the old teſtament, how litle we truſt in prophecyes of Chriſt, may be ſeene in the written commentaries of Caluine, Muſculus, & ſuch other. The names of a great number of the ſolemne feaſtes, (as Briſtow ſayth) doth argue in deede the Papiſts ether to haue inuented thẽ, or to haue abuſed them, as Candelmas, Corpus Chriſti day &c, but that the ſame were inuented by that auncient Church, ẅ celebrated the natiuity, reſurrection, aſcention of Chriſt &c: it is vtterly vntrue. For your owne Durand teſtifieth, that many of them were of late Popes inſtitutiõ, ẅ were of another factiõ, but no: of the church of Chriſt. Howe vaine a brag it is, that the martyrs were of the Papiſtes religion, becauſe they keepe holy their dayes, I leaue to be anſwered with childrens laughture.

But it is a great offence I weene, that Proteſtants haue put downe moſt of the Saincts daies, & namely S. Lawrence his day, & all our Ladies daies, aſſumption & all. If a man ſhoulde aſke you wherefore you keepe not S. Abrahams day, cõſidering he was the father of the faithfull, nor S. Eſayes &c: what could you anſwer? As for the Ladies daies ẅ he complaineth to be put downe by vs, namely the feaſts of her conception, natiuitye, viſitation & aſſumption, the Church could be without ſome of thẽ more then 12 hundreth yeares. For Vrbanus the 6. inſtituted the feaſt of the viſitation of ſome called the new found Lady daye about the yeare of Chriſt 1380. as the very popiſhe ſeruice of that daye confeſſeth in the firſt leſſõ. The feaſt of the natiuity, is not much elder as both the leſſons & Durand do acknowledge, which affirmeth that one Fulbertus a Biſhop Cardinal made part of the ſeruice. That the feaſt of the aſſumption can not be very aũncient, it appeareth not onely by the barbarous hymnes in the popiſhe Churche that daye, but alſo by

the leſſons taken out of Bede, by whiche it is manifeſt, that the Church coulde be without that goodly ſolemnitie, more then 700. yeares after Chriſt, as a great number of other feſtiuities which borrow their leſſons out of Bede, doe ſhew ſufficiently, that the popiſh ſeruice is nether ſo auncient nor ſo vniuerſall, as the Papiſtes moſt impudently doe affirme. As for the feaſt of the conception of the Virgine Marye, is not full one hundreth yeare olde, being decreed by Sixtus the 4. in great deſpight of the Dominike Fryers, which did both preach and wright againſt it.

Wherefore there is no ſuch *intollerable fault aſſuredly* committed, in omitting ſuch feſtiuities, as Briſtow cryeth out, nether we lacke proper dayes of our Ladye, as he ſayth, whereby he bewrayeth the groſſe Idolatrie of Papiſtes, which are not content to honor our Sauiour Chriſt in his Sainctes, but the Sainctes muſt haue proper dayes dedicated to their honor alone, and vtterly ſeperated from the honor of Chriſt. For it ſatisfieth not Briſtow, that we keepe holy the annunciation & purification of Mary, becauſe the one of them ſayth he, is the conception, the other the preſentation of Chriſt. But Papiſtes keepe her natiuitie, viſitation, conception, and aſſumption, which are the proper dayes of our Lady. I paſſe ouer that he affirmeth the aſſumption of her body as a certaine truth, which the very popiſh leſſons ſonge on that feſtiuitie, leaue in doubt, and incline rather to the contrary opinion, that ſhe was aſſumpted onely in ſoule. Likewiſe that he calleth her the Lady of Sainctes and Angels, which title the holy Scriptures doe not only not giue vnto her, but plainly denye. For there is but one Lord *Eph.* 4. both of men and of Angels, which doth not onely exclude all other Lordes of the maſculine gender, but much more all Ladyes, and generally ſurmounteth all principalitie, power, Lordſhip, and euery name that is named, both in this world and in the world to come. *Eph.* 1. 2. The Virgine Mary is therefore no Lady of Sainctes and Angells, but a fellow ſeruaunt of God

with

with them. *Luke* 1 48. *Apoc.* 22.9. What excellency ſoeuer ſhe hath of Gods gift, more then any of them. That we keepe no ſolemnitie of S. Lawrens, it is not for any contempt of his holines, nor for any worſhip of Iohn Baptiſt and the Apoſtles, that we ſolemnize their memories. But therein the Churche vſeth her libertie as in things indifferent. Whereas Briſtow *doubteth not that if any of vs would once be preſent at the reuerent ſolemne doing of the popiſh Catholike ſeruice, eſpecially at Chriſtmas, Eaſter or ſuch like time, but it would melt our ſtony harts with ioye*, &c. He bewrayeth many poyntes of follye at once. For firſt many thouſands of vs, haue bene preſent, and with greefe of hart haue ſeene and beheld the doing of thoſe Idolatrous ſolemnities. Secondly he declareth, how he him ſelfe is caried away with piping, ſinging, ſenſing, and ſwinging in copes &c, ſo that he can not diſcerne the true worſhip of God, which is in ſpirite and veritie, from the carnall and counterfeit ſolemnities of Idolatry and ſuperſtition. Laſt of all, how childiſhly doth he referre all Catholike ſolemnitie to the vaine pompe vſed onely in great and Cathedrall Churches, when a thowſand pariſhes beſide in the poore contrey townes, haue all their traſhe ſo beggerly and rudely ſet forth, that the Papiſtes them ſelues laughe them to ſcorne. The reſt of this motiue is ſpent in diſſwading Papiſts from learning our ſeruice, or ſermons, or reading of our bookes, by which it is plain, that he ſo much miſtruſteth his cauſe, that he dare not once permit his diſciples to inquire of it, or to heare any thing that may be ſayd to the contrary. As for popiſhe prieſtes that ſay the newe (as he termeth it) ſeruice, I woulde they woulde followe his councell to ſaye it no more. That it is not lawfull for Chriſtians to communicate with heretiks, or Idolaters, it is a playne caſe: But it ſhall neuer be proued that they be heretikes, which teach nothing but the doctrine of holy Scripture, or that they are Idolaters, which are ready to giue their liues rather then to worſhip Idolls. But the yeare of Iubely is a greate motiue for greate

fooles to embrace popery, which Iubely Pope Boniface the 8. did first institute in the yeare of our Lord 1300 by apish or rather deuelish imitation of the fathers of the old testament for filthy lukers sake, beside the horrible blashemye of full remission of sinnes graunted by the Pope in that yeare, which is denied to be giuen by the death of Christ. As for the Iubely, which Bristow speaketh of anno 1575. is of a later institution ordeyned to be kept euery 25. yeare, because it was to long for the Pope to tary vntill the hundreth and 50. yeare, as Boniface appoynted. This is the antiquitie of that Iubely pardon, and pilgrimage.

The miracle which S. Augustine reporteth of Innocentia that was warned in her dreame, to desire the first woman which she did meete, returning from baptisme at Easter, to signe her breast with the signe of the crosse, on which was a canker, for cure of which she had longe prayed vnto God: declareth in deede the vertue of Christ, which can vse all meanes to worke health where it pleaseth him, but nothing at all maketh for popery. For if it hath pleased God at any tyme to worke wonders by the signe of the crosse, it followeth not thereof ether that the signe of the crosse hath any vertue in it, more then that hemme of Christes garment had, by which a woman also was healed, or els that an ordinary ceremonye is to be made of signing with the crosse, more then of touchinge the hemme of anye garment.

In the 22. demaunde he asketh whether in the most auncient seruice of the primitiue Church, there was not alwayes prayer for the deade and to Saynctes, the ceremonies vsed by Papistes in baptisme &c. I answere, no. Cyprian whome he quoteth *Ep.* 66. speaketh not of prayer for the deade in any place, but of oblation for the falling a sleepe that is thankes giuing for the departure of the deade, and naming them in the prayers of the Church which dyed in the faith of Christ, and in obedience of the Church.

In

In the tyme of Euſebius that errour of praying for the deade was in deede receyued in many places of the Churche, which beganne firſt amonge the Montaniſts. The ceremonies of exufflation and exorciſme were not idlely vſed in the primitiue Church, as they are of the Papiſtes, but when the perſons to be baptiſed were ſenſibly poſſeſſed with deuills as appeareth in Cyprian *lib.3.Ep.7.ad Magnum.*

Likewiſe where he demaund-th whether we reade at any tyme when Maſſe did firſt come into the Churches. I aunſwere if by Maſſe he meaneth that popiſh forme of ſacrificing, which they vſe and call Maſſe, we reade of euery parte of it when and by what Pope it came in. By Maſſe he meaneth the doctrine of the carnall preſence, tranſubſtantiation, adoration of the ſacrament and making it a ſacrifice propitiatory for the quicke and the deade, I aunſwer that we reade all theſe hereſies to haue crept into the Church of Rome, ſince the firſt ſix hundreth yeares. And as for the ſubſtance of the canon, being contrary to the doctrine of the Apoſtles, is eaſie to be proued that it came not from the Apoſtles, beſide that ſome of them aſcribe it to Gregory, and Gregory him ſelfe to Scholaſticus, ſo that being of ſome antiquitie it conteyneth in it, matter repugnant euen vnto the popiſh hereſies. For firſt it calleth the cõſecrated breade and wine the ſacrifices, and offereth them for the whole Church. Secondly after conſecration it calleth the Sacrament *panem ſanctum vitæ æternæ, & calicem ſaluis æternæ*, holye breade of eternall life, and cuppe of eternall health, of the giftes of God, and prayeth God to accept it as the ſacrifice of Abell.

Thirdly the prieſt prayeth that God will commaund ſame to be caried by an Angell into his high altar &c.

Fourthly he prayeth for all them that haue receyued the ſame ſacrament with him which can not ſtand with a priuate Maſſe.

Finally, that it came not euidently of the Apoſtles, as

Briſtow impudently affirmeth, it may be euidently ſeene by this, that diuerſe Sainctes are named in it, which liued more then two hundreth yeares after the Apoſtles as Coſmus Damiaius &c. And that we are able to finde more fault with it then with *Gloria Patri, Te Deum &c.* it is plentifully declared by many volumes, and namely by Biſhop of Sarum in his ſermon and defence of the ſame againſt Harding.

The 33. motiue is the 21. demaund.

Eccleſiaſticall monuments and liuings. Churches the worke of the Catholikes. Vniuerſities of heretikes and Catholikes. Proteſtants be vſurpers of other mens liuings.

Briſtow. Although a great number of churches, that are now ſtanding were builded by Papiſtes, and for Popery, yet not all. For the chiefeſt and moſt auncient Cathedrall

Fulke. churches, were neither builded by Papiſtes, nor for Popery, but by Chriſtian Princes and for the vſe of Chriſtian religion. Of ſuch churches writeth Euſeb. *in vita Conſt. lib. 30. & Hiſt. Eccl. lib. 10. cap. 4.* where was but one table or altare, which was remoueable & made of bords placed in the mideſt of the Church, contrary to the popiſh faſhion which hath many Altars, and all againſte walles or pillers, and the chiefeſt againſt the fartheſt wall, moſt commonly. It is a fonde reaſon of Briſtowe that they were built for Popery, becauſe they are builte in length to the Eaſt, or in forme of a Croſſe. For many are built rounde, and thoſe with croſſe Iles, are moſte vnmeete for maſſe at the high Altar, which they that ſit in the croſſe Yles cannot ſee. Likewiſe Bede, whome Briſtowe in the demaunde without ſhame doth quote for the contrary, teſtifieth that the churches of the Romaines. lib. 3. Cap. 4. ſpeaking of Niua, one that was brought vp at Rome, which at a place called *Candida caſa* now Whiterne: *Made a Church of ſtone of an other faſhion, then the Britans were wont to build.* Theſe are ỹ words

of

of Bede of Stapletons translation. And concerning the founding of Ecclesiasticall liuings and Vniuersities, we know that the first dotation of Churches, was by Christian Princes, what if superstition hath added any thing to them? Nether the building of Churches, nor the founding of liuings and Vniuersities, doth proue the builders or founders to be of good religion, nor yet cõdemne the vsers of such Churches, liuings and Vniuersities, of vsurping or sacrilege. The idolatrous Church of Pantheon at Rome, was turned into *Maria rotunda*. Gregory councelled Augustine to conuert the Idolatrous Churches of the Saxons, to the vse of Christian religion. *Beda lib. 1. cap.* 30. The Vniuersitie of Athens, founded by heathen Philosophers, was after frequented by Christian schollers as testifieth Gregory Nazianzene *in Monod.* And if we beleue our English stories, ỹ liuings of the Idolatrous Flamines & Arch Flamines was conuerted to the mayntenance of the Bishops and ArchBishops.

The 34. motiue is the 23. demaund.

Heretikes are apes of the Catholikes. The Churches learning and wisedom. The Communion booke an apish imitation of our Masse booke. Brifton.

The maner of Apes is to counterfeit and follow visible actions, without any meaning or profit. Such imitation haue we none, but the apish Church of Rome, is ful of such following of the gestures of Christ, in their masse and other ceremonies. Yea they counterfeit the voice of Pilate & Iudas in reading the gospel on Palme Sonday. They play the apes of the Primitiue Church, in coniuring the deuil in baptisme. Yea they be the apes of Aaron & the leuitical Priestes, in their robes, sensing, & sacrificing. The very Pagans they follow in ceremonies & festiuities, as their owne Durand confesseth. In whose *Rationale diuinorum*, you may see the learning & wisdom Fulke.

of the popish Church, for all their mischieuous mysteries.

As for vs, we imitate nothing that they doe, to get commendation by similitude of their doings, but rather we abhorre whatsoeuer hath but a shew of popery, if we vse any thing rightly, which is abused of them, we are not therefore apes of them, but they apes of the auncient fathers, whose doctrine we doe truely follow, as they vainely imitate and in imitation falsely peruert their examples. That the communion booke is an apish imitation of the masse booke, is a most shameless lye. For what similitude hath our ministration of the communion, with their masse, any more, then our doctrine with theirs? If any thinge in ceremonies or discipline haue bene tollerated not altogether purged from all similitude of popish actions, by yelding vnto the infirmitie of the weaker sort: yet is the Church of God perfect in her selfe, and needeth not to borrow of any secte any thing, for her perfect furniture in doctrine, ceremonies, or discipline, but hath absolute rules to direct her in any of these expressed in the holy Scriptures.

For the diuision of parishes, the holding of Councells, excommunication, suspension, publike solemnising of mariage with the lawes of the same, punishing of heretikes by death, &c. are all manifestly proued out of the Scriptures. Probat of testaments and such like matters pertayne to the ciuill lawe. And whereas Bristow sayth, we could not tell that we shoulde vse baptisinge of men, more then washinge of feete, or this lesse then that, or one to be a sacrament and not the other, except we had bene taught by the popishe Churche, it is a greate falshoode. For althoughe we might alleage the iudgement of the moste auncient Churche of Christ, which did not accept that action of Christ as a sacrament: yet the wordes of our Sauiour Christ are manifest, which doth not institute a sacrament or visible signe of the inuisible grace of God giuen vnto vs, but onely giueth vs an example thereby of seruice

ablc

able humilitie one to an other. *Ioan.* 13.12. Wherefore no more in this then in any other matter doe we take any light, out of the bookes and doings of thoſe owles, that flye in the darkenes of mens traditions, but onely out of the lawe of God which is a light vnto our ſteps, and a lanterne vnto our feete, that we neede not like apes counterfeit externall toyes as they doe, but being followers of God as wellbeloued children, we may walke in loue as Chriſt hath loued vs, and ſo farre to followe the ſteppes of other men, as we ſee plainly that they haue followed Chriſt.

The 35. *motiue is the* 25. *demaund.*

States of perfection. Monkes & Monaſteries. Parliament Briſtow. religion.

We confeſſe that we haue no ſtates of perfection in this life amonge vs, which to affirme in any mortall man is blaſphemye againſt the bloode of Chriſt. As for Monkes and Fryers names, Eremites, &c: none were farther from a Chriſtian or honeſt life then they, as the worlde knoweth ſufficientlye. And therefore by lawe they and their Monaſteries were iuſtly ſubuerted. As for the ſolitarye men of the auncient tymes, dwelling by them ſelues, or in the deſert places called *Monachi*, *Anchoritæ* or *Eremitæ*, theſe popiſhe orders, of whoſe ſubuerſion Briſtow complayneth, were no more like vnto them, then Apes and Monkeyes are to men and women. Fulke.

The communitye of goodes that was in the Church of the Apoſtles. *Act.* 4. was none other, then ſuche as is and ought to be amonge all true Chriſtians. which was not as Briſtowe ignorauntlye and impudently affirmeth, to liue without propriety of goodes, hauing all thinges in an Anabaptiſticall communitie, but that they accompted nothing of that they poſſeſſed to be their owne, when the neceſſitie of their bre-

thren required the vse therof. *Act.* 4. 32. & 34. And *Act.* 5. 4. Peter affirmeth that both the lande and the price thereof was in the proprietye of Ananias, so that he might haue retayned ether his land or the whole price thereof, but that he was an hypocrite and would beare the Churche in hande, that he had brought the whole price, when he withdrewe a parte thereof. As for Virgines although there be fewer amongest vs, that boast of that profession, yet are there more both men and women which freely keepe their purpose of virginitie, then were amonge those popishe vowed cloystralls.

The 36. motiue is the 46. demaund.

Bristow. *The state of our predecessors. Prayer for the deade, the ground of building Christian monuments. Vniuersities of heretikes and Catholikes, Protestants be ashamed of their fathers.*

Fulke. The demaund serueth to be contrary to the motiue, for in the motiue he confesseth, that we will not condemne our aunceſtors that haue dyed these many hundred yeares in popish ignorance, nor the auncient doctors which haue held some errors which the Papistes doe hold, but in the demaund he asketh, if all these are damned in hell, if not, then theirs is the true Church, & those errors are truth. I aunswer we deale not with condemnation of men, for lacke of two causes, which make a Iudge, the one austeritie, the other is knowledge. Concerning the first, it pertayneth onely to Christ, to be the Iudge of the quicke and the deade, whose office we dare not vsurpe, otherwise then he hath commaunded vs, to pronounce sentence out of his word: concerning the latter, we take not vpon vs to knowe ether the faith or repentance of them that dyed before our time, and therefore we commit their iudgement to God. But generally we are taught by the Scriptures, that such as holde

holde the onely foundation which is Ieſus Chriſt, in a true faith, ſhall be ſaued although they build vpon this foundation chaffe, ſtraw, wood, &c. 1. *Cor.* 3. And therefore we doubt not but S. Auguſtine, Chryſoſtom, Hierom, Gregory, Bernard, & many thowſands, euen in the tyme of great blindnes, holding the ſame only foundation, may be ſaued, notwithſtanding the chaffe and ſtubble of a few errors which the former ſort did hold, or a number of errors and ſuperſtitions wherewith the later ſort were defiled. As for Fraunces and Dominike ſuch late leaders of the locuſtes, we rather thinke they are returned into the bottomleſſe pit from whence they came, then that they be Saincts in heauen. But if we excuſe the reſt by ignorance, Briſtow aſketh why we condemne not Auguſtine, which was not ignoraunt of our doctrine, becauſe he condemned it for moſt wicked hereſie in Ærius, Iouinian and Vigilantius, who although they be our fathers, he ſayth we are aſhamed to bleſſe their memorie. Firſt concerning Iouinian, although he helde an hereſie, in not preferring virginitie before mariage in ſome reſpect, yet haue we nothing to doe with him, for we hold not that opinion, which if we did yet were it no damnable hereſy. Touching AErius he is cõdemned of Auguſtine for an Arrian, his opinió of prayer for the deade although it were not liked of Auguſtine, yet doth he in no place condemne it for moſt wicked hereſie, as Briſtow calleth it, but that he did allowe prayer for the deade, it was an error of ignoraunce, euen in S. Auguſtine, as that he thought the communion neceſſary for infants. *Cont. duas ep. Pelag. lib. 2. cap. 4.* As for Vigilantius I finde him not reckened ether by Epiphanius or Auguſtine for an heretike, or for one that erred in doctrine, although Hierom did write ſo bitterly againſt him, who likewiſe did write againſt Auguſtine and Ruffinus, yet are nether of both accompted for heretikes. And AErius as he helde ſome truth with vs againſt prayer for the deade, ſo helde he alſo much popiſhe ſuperſtition and errour, for like the order of

Carthusians, they of his sect admitted none to their fellowship, but such as professed continence, & so renounced the world, that they possessed nothing in proper. As testifieth Epiphanius and Augustine. And Philaster affirmeth, that they absteyned also from eating of flesh. So that all thinges considered, Ærius mainteyned the doctrine of the Papistes, as much as of the Protestantes. That our preachers in pulpits, praise God for the founders of colledges and schooles, of learning, by name, what maketh this for allowance of their religion. God is to be praised for such benefits as he hath bestowed vpon his church or any members thereof, euen by Turks and Heathen men. Wherfore this is a very slow motiue vnto Popery. For whether the founders were good or euill men, and what intent soeuer they had, their benefits are now vsed to the glory of God, & therefore God for them and their benefits is greatly to be praised.

The 37. motiue hath neuer a demaund that I can aptly referre vnto it.

Bristow. *The only knowne & vndoubted mother of Christs children for a thousand yeares together. The church is euerlasting and visible.*

Fulke. The Popish church hath not only bene ỹ only known church and vndoubted mother of Christes children for these thousand yeares. First because it is not of so many yeares continuaunce, the mysterie of iniquitie hauing not bene in highest degree of wickednesse before the councell of Constance, where notwithstanding the institution of Christ and the practise of the primitiue church, the communion of the Lordes bloud was taken from the people. Secondly the Popish church was neuer acknowledged by all the true children of Christes church, for their mother, which was a steppemother and a persecuter of them. Thirdly the Popish church

was

wns neuer ỹ only reputed church or mother of Christs children, of all them that professe Christianitie for the churches of the East, as great and as large as she was in the West, woulde neuer so accompt the Popish steppedame of Rome, but did separate them selues from her communion. Fourthly the Catholike church of Christes members dispersed ouer all the world, vnder the tyranny both of the Turke & the Pope, haue in all times protested, that ỹ Romish Apostolical synagoge, is the whore of Babylon and see of Antichrist.

The places of *Mich.* 4. and *Esa* 61. which he citeth to proue that the church must be alwayes visible, you shall finde aunswered with many other in mine ouerthrow of Stapletons fortres *lib.* 1. *cap.* 13. And wheras Bristow confesseth, that a mist may hide an hil that is neuer so high, from some wicked sighted men that are without it, but neuer from them that are within it, no meruaile if the spirituall church of Christ, being lifted vp aboue the top of all hills, not in worldly glory, but euen vnto heauenly dignitie, hath long remained hid from them, that haue no spirituall eyes at all. But Bristow thinketh it straũge, that a mist should continue a thousand yeres together. Then I aske him what hath hindered the greatest parte of all the worlde, seduced by Mahometistrie and Gentilitie that for these thousand yeres they haue not seene the height of the Popish church. If he say not a mist about their church but a blindnesse in the others eyes to be the cause, the same I aunswere for the Catholike dispersed church of Christ, which the Papistes pretend that this thousand yeares they could not see. Although as I haue often sayd, Papistry is not halfe so olde in the greatest heresies and absurdities, which now she mayntayneth.

The 38. *motiue is the* 24. *demaund also the* 48. *and the* 17.

Celebration & operation of Christes death. The sacrifice of Bristow.

Fulke. In the Popish churchis no celebration,but a derogation of the merite of Christs death, by the blasphemous sacrifice of the masse. But Bristow in the 24. demaunde, asketh vs whether we be content to trie religion by the Priesthood that hath bene frō the beginning of Christs church.I answere that we must first consent of the name of Priest and Priesthoode, whereof also in the same demaunde he cauilleth,that we haue chaunged the name & therefore haue chaunged the order. The name I say of Priesthood & Priest must be cōsidered,either according to the Etymologie & deriuation, or els according to the present vse thereof.And according to the deriuation,we cōfesse ý this word Priest, cōming of the greeke word Presbyteros signifieth the same o der,which is instituted by God,like as the word Bishop c mming of Episcopus, for which if any man vse the name of Elder & superintendent, he varieth nothing in the worlde, from the signification of Presbyter and Episcopus,and much lesse setteth vp a new order as Bristow most vainly doth cauill. For in that sence, we abhorre not the name of Priest & Bishop.But when according to the present vse, this word Priest is takē for him which in greke is called ἱερεὺς and in Latine *Sacerdos* that is one appointed to offer a special sacrifice for which our English tongue hath none other worde but Priest as Bristow doth well confesse: In this sence we deny that we haue any speciall Priesthoode or Priestes among vs but the only Priesthoode and high Priest our Lorde and Sauiour Iesus Christ, and the generall Priesthoode that is common to all the Saynctes of God. *Apoc.* 1 6. But in the former sence, we haue the same office of Bishoppe, Elder or Priest which being ordeyned by the holy Ghost, hath continewed in the church vntill this time. But this will Bristowe disproue, by two reasons. First that auncient Bishoppes and Priestes were made by Bishoppes and

and Prieſtes, and not by Kinges and Queenes: ſecondly they were made to offer ſacrifice, and euen for the deade. Concerning the firſt it is true that the auncient Prieſtes were ſo ordeyned, but it is a moſt impudent ſlaunder, that we are made Biſhoppes or Prieſts by Kinges or Queenes. For the worlde knoweth we are ordeyned by the Biſhoppes and Elders of the church and not by the Prince. But that the auncient Biſhoppes and Elders of the church ſince Chriſt, were ordeyned to offer ſacrifice for the quicke and the dead, it is vtterly falſe. For albeit the auncient writers vnproperly vſed the names of Prieſt and ſacrifice, yet did they neuer meane to ſet vp a newe Prieſthoode or ſacrifice, to ouerthrowe the only true Prieſthode and ſacrifice of Chriſtes death as in many places of their writinges moſt manifeſtly doth appeare, but only they did continew a memory of the ſacrifice of Chriſtes death in the celebration of the Lordes ſupper *Chriſ. ad Heb. cap.* 10. *Hom.* 17. and a ſacrifice of prayſe and thankeſgeuing *Auguſt. De ciuit. Dei. lib.* 10. *cap* 6. *Hoc eſt ſacrificium Chriſtianorum multi vnum corpus ſumus in Chriſto: quod etiam Sacramento altaris fidelibus notũ frequentat eccleſia, vbi ei demonſtratur quod in ea oblatione quam offert ipſa offeratur.* This (ſayth Auguſtine ſpeaking of the ſacrifice of thankeſgeuing) is the ſacrifice of Chriſtians, we being many are one bodie in Chriſt, which thing alſo the church frequenteth in the Sacrament of the altar well knowne to the faithfull, where it is ſhewed vnto her, that in the ſame oblation which ſhe offereth, ſhe her ſelfe is offered. Likewiſe *cap.* 20. ſpeaking of the ſacrifice of Chriſtes death he ſayth. *Per hoc & Sacerdos eſt, ipſe offerens, ipſe & oblatio. Cuius rei ſacramentum quotidianum eſſe voluit eccleſiæ ſacrificium, cum ipſius corporis ipſe ſit caput, & ipſius capitis ipſa ſit corpus, tam ipſa per ipſum quam ipſe per ipſam ſuetus offerri.* By this alſo he is a Prieſt, he him ſelfe offering and he him ſelfe being the oblation. Of which thing he would haue the dayly ſacrifice of the church to be a Sacrament, ſeeing

that of her beinge his bodie he is the heade, and of him being her heade ſhe is the bodie, as well ſhe by him, as he by her, being accuſtomed to be offered. So that the errour of praying for the deade which preuayled within three hundreth yeares after Chriſt, was at the firſt, without blaſphemie of ſacrificing the bodye of Chriſt for the quicke and the deade. In this foure and twentie demaunde Briſtowe aſketh further whether in the auncient Church there were not Subdeacons, Acolytes, Exorciſtes, dore keepers &c. I aunſwere there were ſuch offices, appoynted for ayde of diuerſe partes of the miniſterie, whereof the Papiſtes reteyne only the names, without any exerciſe of the offices. And the offices were ſuche for the moſt parte, as were proper for the tyme of perſecution, and as they had no inſtruction of the worde of God but were ordeyned by the Church, ſo by the Church they are thought vnneceſſarie. In the forty eight demaunde which is a parte of this motiue, he aſketh whether their Church only hath not grace in her Sacramentes, merite in her workers, force in her worde, power in her teaching, her children the ſaddeſt ſorte of people, men of beſt order in families, townes, and cities, &c. I aunſwere, the Popiſh Church hath no Sacraments but ſuch as ſhe falſely vſurpeth, namely the Sacrament of baptiſme, which as Auguſtine ſayth againſt the Donatiſtes, may be geuen out of the true Church, but hath no vertue or grace but in the true Church. As for merite of workes is blaſphemous agaynſte the
« mercie of God. *Vnde mihi tantum meriti eſt* (ſayth
« Ambroſe *Ad virgin. exhort.*) *cui indulgentia pro coro-*
« *na eſt*. Whence ſhoulde I haue ſo great merite ſeeing mercie is my crowne. And touching force of her worde and power of her teaching, if there were not greater terrour of her tyrannie and allurement in her worldly glorie ſhe ſhoulde haue fewer partakers. For except the efficacie of errour which God hath ſent for the puniſhment of the vnbeleeuing worlde, ſhe hath

no

no power of the worde of God, nor of his holy ſpirite, to conuert the hearts of men to Chriſte, but externall intiſements like Mermaydes ſonges, to ſeduce men to their deſtruction. And as for her Children the Papiſts, although ſome bee more modeſt then the reſte, as ther be euen among the Turkes and Heathen, none are more light, vaine, diſordered, proude, proude, deceitfull, couetous, worldly, luxurious, malicious, and cruell, not onely at Rome, and abrode, where they bee in their ruffe, but euen heere in Englande, where they haue not all their will. I except a fewe, which beeing deceiued, not of malice but of ignoraunce, God in time may bring to the knowledge of the trueth, if they be not diſsemblers and ſeeke by all meanes to abſent themſelues from it.

Furthermore how e malicioufly he ſlaundereth the Church of God let God himſelfe reuenge, where hee ſayth, we haue no preaching of Penaunce, no grace in ſacramentes, nothing but ſinne in good woorkes, although they be doone in Chriſte. No power to bringe vnder Deuils, no bleſſing, no comforte, yea that all followers bee they neuer ſo wicked and flagitious, haue they onely fayth and no doubte, they ſhall bee ſaued. And yet the forgetfull Lyer confeſſeth afterwarde, that wee affirme that true fayth cannot bee without true and perfect doctrine, nor without good woorkes.

But what Fayth doe you preach or teach (ſayth Briſtowe) *Not that Chriſtian fayth which is conteyned in the Articles of our Creede, but a ſpeciall Fayth, or an vndoubted perſwaſion that hee is predeſtinate.* How ſoeuer therefore it bee that Briſtowe is diſpoſed for to lye and rayle, they that either heare our Sermons or reade our Bookes of Iuſtification by Faith onely, doe knowe that wee teach none other Faith by which a manne may bee iuſtifyed, but euen that Faith, which is onely contayned in the Articles of our Creede. The very firſte woorde whereof

I beleeue

I beleue, teacheth not the implicite faith of the papists, but a speciall and singular faith and truste that euerye Christian man must haue in God the father and in Iesus Christ, which was conceiued, borne, deade, risen againe, &c. for vs, and in the holy Ghoste, by whome the vertue of Christes conception, natiuitie, suffring, death, resurrection, and assention, is communicated to vs, beeing members of the Catholike church, in which we receiue forgiuenes of sinnes, and thereby beeing made righteous, wee receiue the rewarde of righteousnesse, which is the resurrection vnto glory, and the life euerlasting, which was prepared for vs before the world was made, which faith no blasphemous heretikes can haue, that deny any of these Articles, what perswasion soeuer they haue, w faith the Papists haue not, which neuer put their trust in God by Iesus Christe, but in their owne woorkes &c, nor yet haue any certaintie of their saluation, whereas all they that truely put their trust in God, shall not be confounded. From which faith the Papists are so farre, that they think it not conuenient that the people should know and rehearse the articles of the Creede in the mother toung, although nowe of late, they haue set foorth English cathechismes, as Apes of the true Church, not that their Disciples might haue more knowledge, seing they hold that ignorance is the mother of Deuotion, but that they see they cannot though for shame they would conceale this knowledge from them. And when they cannot hinder them of the knoweledge of the Articles of faith, howe I pray you doe they teach them to beleeue them? Euen with an historicall faith, which is none others then such as the deuill beleeueth, namely that there is one God, that Iesus Christe was borne, crucyfied, ascended into Heauen &c.

In the 17. Demaunde he asketh vs whether we reade not that the Christians of the Primitiue church, had an ordinary power and office to cast out diuels, which we acknowledge that we haue not, but the Papistes haue.

To

To this I aunſwere, that in the Primitiue church were diuerſe giftes of healing, caſting out of Deuils & working of miracles, which were temporall, and are long ſince ceaſed to be ordinary, and therefore wee doe in deede confeſſe that we haue no ſuch ordinary power. Neither doe we beleue that the papiſts haue any ſuch, what iugling or counterfaiting of miracles ſoeuer is among them, their forgery hath to often beene tryed to their ſhame.

To conclude, our Church hath Chriſt and his ſpirit, and therefore all graces & bleſſings whatſoeuer Chriſt hath promiſed to be perpetuall in the ſame, to the ſaluation of his elect and the glory of his name.

The 39. motiue is in parte contayned in the 48. demaund.

Teaching the narrowe way, and liuing after it. Who be Briſtow.
nowe followers of Proteſtants. Why there bee ſo many Atheiſts in England. England beware of deſtruction.

The doctrine of Purgatory and ſatiſfaction of Gods wrath by workes of our owne or of other mens. The doctrine of pardons, the doctrine of Grace giuen by ſacraments, *Ex opere operato*. The ſacrifice of the maſſe & c. are doctrines that teach the brode way leading vnto deſtruction, while they bring men into ſecuritie and confidence in vaine helpes. And that is the cauſe that Papiſts and Popes themſelues of all other haue beene and are the moſt wicked. The number of Atheiſts that are in England are not made, but diſcerned by the preaching of the Goſpel. And yet neither are there ſo many nor ſo impudent profeſſors of Atheiſme in England, as there be in Italie and euen in Rome it ſelfe. Where the Pope hath beene condemned in generall councell for an Atheiſt, as Iohn the 23. in the councell of Conſtans. Where Pope Leo counteth the Goſpell for a fable of Fulke.

Christ. Pope Iuly will eate hogges flesh in despight of God.

The sinnes I confesse of England are greate, and such as call to God for vengeance without heartie repentance, and the greatest sinne is ingratitude in the multitude, refusing sincerly to imbrace the Gospell, and in other hypocrisie which abusing the name of the Gospell, haue an outwarde shewe of godlynesse, but deny the power thereof. Yet is there bothe in the state (whiche Bristowe moste traitorously doth slaunder) and in the Church of England, yea in the Realme of Englande, more sinceritie, fidelitie, honestie, Charitie, humilitie, Chastitie, and godlinesse, and lesse Atheisme, infidelitie, crueltie, pride, ryote, whoredome, swearing and forswearing, Couetousnesse, sacriledge, and all manner of wickednesse, more I say of vertue and lesse of vice in England at this time, then is or hath beene at any time with in those fiue hundred yeeres in Rome or Italie. So that if a Booke were made as Bristow seemeth to threaten of the behauiour of the worst and moste counterfaite Protestantes in Englande, yet shall it neuer bee founde so vile and abhominable as are the lyues of the moste of the Popes themselues, set foorth not by Protestants in our dayes, but by all popish storyes before we were borne.

The 40. motiue hath no speciall demand aunswering to it.

Bristow.

Obedient subiects. In what Church is Christianitie of all lawes which was Saincte Augustines Motiue. Obedience of the Catholikes to their superiours bothe ecclesiastieall and temporall Protestantes be malignours of higher powers.

Fulke.

If this Motiue had beene sette foorth before the Rebellion in the North, or if so many trayterouse practises from Rome hadd not beene openly discouered

red peraduenture Briſtowe might haue moued ſome mountaines by it.

But nowe *Quis tulerit Gracchum de ſeditione loquentem?* Who canne abide the Papiſtes to bragge of Obedience? Yet both the ciuill Lawe and the common Lawe of Englande are made to ſerue popiſhe Religion, if wee will beleeue Briſtowe. God bee thanked they bothe ſerue the Church of God not onely in Englande, but in all other Realmes and ſtates that haue embraced the Goſpell, the ciuill and municipall Lawes, without any alteration of the ſtate, ſaue for the aduancement of Gods glory.

But Proteſtants hee ſayth, bee Maligners of the higher powers, ſuch as Sainct Iude calleth contemners of Lordeſhippe, and blaſphemers of Maieſtie. Or elſe the Papiſtes be ſuch in that blaſphemouſe Bull, for which Felton was hanged, in which are ſo vile opprobrious and contumelious ſlanders of our Prince, that for her honour and my dueties ſake, I will not vouchſafe to name them.

Hee obiecteth vnto vs Knoxes Booke againſt the regement of women, which was but his priuate opinion and condemned of all our Church, and of the Church of Geneua alſo. Hee obiecteth the ciuill warres in Fraunce, in which the Kinges themſelues haue alwayes in publique inſtrumentes diſcharged the Proteſtants of all diſloyaltie, and acknowledged that whatſoeuer they did in taking Armes, they did it in the ſeruice of them and of their Realme. As for the murdering of great Perſonages, Waſting of Cities and Couutries &c. the worlde knoweth whether partie is chargeable with the crime. And to ſeeke no farther proues of the trayterous and diſobedient heartes of all wicked and pernitiouſe Papiſtes, Briſtow him ſelfe confeſſeth in this motiue, that they *be duely diſcharged from ſubiection and the Prince from dominion by the ſouereigne authoritie of the common Paſtor of Religion.*

But where in the Deuils name, hath your soueraigne Pastor and Prelate of Rome, such authoritie? From Peter? Did Peter discharge the subiectes of Nero from subiection, or Nero from his gouernment, although he were a moste wicked persecutor of the Church, or rather doth he not commaund all persons to obey him. 1. *Pet*, 2. 14. & 17. O trayterous hypocrites, which haue made all whole, whē you pray for the Princes conuersion, so deposed by your Pope. The Lord our God defende our soueraigne, as well from your prayers as from your practises. Another argument of your obedience, you shew, where you saye, that *of Catholikes, throughly discharged of their fealtie, yet for common humanitie, for their accustomed vse, for their cōtinuall & (as it were) naturall institution, the prince is better obeyed and serued, then of the Protestants, which in heart are in a manner all Puritants.* Note heere that Papists professe them selues to be subiects of curtesie, not of dutie, of custome, not of conscience, of naturall institution, not of the lawe of God. Our Lord and sauiour send her maiestie few such subiects and seruants.

The 41. motiue is the 19. demaund.

Briffow.

The Church to which Princes doe homage.

Fulke.

The true Catholike church of Christ, is that church of which it was prophecied, that Kinges and Queenes shoulde be the nurse thereof, and as obedient children doe homage thereto, as to the mother of all the faithfull. To this church the olde and first Christianed Emperours, Constantius, Iouianus, Theodosius, Valentinianus &c. submitted them selues as obedient children. To this church at this day many Kinges and Queenes doe homage, and are nurses thereof, as the Princes of England, Scotland, Denmarke, Sueuon, Saxonie. But Bristow obiecteth against vs, ỳ our Princes are not taught obedience to the Church, but truely seduced by the

title

title of heade and ſupreme gouernours of the Church. To this I aunſwere that this title of headſhippe and gouernaunce of particular Churches, is none other, but ſuch as they may and ought to holde, with their obedience vnto the vniuerſall Church. Yea their gouernment is ſuch, as therein they ſerue God and the Church, in compelling by lawe and authoritie, all perſons to doe their duties as well in religion, as in ciuill affayres: Not an antichriſtian tyranny, ſuch as the Pope vſurpeth to be Lords ouer our faith, and to make Articles of Religion at their pleaſure, but to prouide that all thinges may be doone according to the word of God.

But Briſtow replyeth that it was not the Popiſh church vnto whome Conſtantine and the reſt of the Chriſtian Emperours yeelded vp the imperiall Cittie of Rome, with all the countrie of Italie. What an impudent lye this is, may eaſely be knowen of all them, which haue read the hiſtoryes which teſtifie that the Emperors of Conſtantinople receiued poſſeſſion in Rome and Italy vntill the time of Charles the great, which was made Emperour by the Pope. In the demaunde Briſtowe aſketh if the firſt Chriſtian Emperours, Conſtantinus, Theodoſius, were not in all pointes of the popiſhe Religion? I anſwere that although they were infected with a few errors, as prayer for the deade &c, yet in the ſubſtance of Chriſtian Religion, they beleeued the ſame that wee beleeue of Iuſtification by faith, onely of the vertue of Chriſtes ſacrifice once offred for all, of the authoritie of the holy Scriptures, and were enemies to the Papiſtes in their chiefe Principle, of the Popes ſupremacie, the carnall preſence, tranſubſtantiation, priuate Maſſe, Communion in one kinde, Images, Prayers in vnknowen language, and many other.

As for the lycence that Briſtowe woulde haue vs procure for them, to appeare with vs before the Queenes highneſſe, to diſpute whether the firſte Chriſtian Emperors were not altogither Papiſts? is nothing elſe but a popiſhe bragge, whiche if it were procured

they would delude the whole purpose with such Cauillations, as they did in the Conference offered vnto them at Westminster, in the firste yeere of her Maiesties raigne: where after they had hearde our side once reade their Booke, they were so discouraged, that they durst abide no more tryall, but shamefully and obstinantely cleane gaue ouer the conference.

The 42 motiue is parte of the 47. demaund.

Bristowe. *The Parliament Church and Religion. Sainct Peter excluded out of Englande by Parliament. Yea Christe, Peter and Paule and other Apostles excluded out of Englande by Parliament. The Apostles were of our Religion. Howe Sainct Augustine should be vsed in England by the Parliament lawe if he were there liuing. Of what Religion and authoritie the Fathers are. Succession. Protestants contrary to them selues.*

Fulke. Wee must consider (sayth Bristowe) what Church that is, where Lawes be made to charge Peter if hee were liuing, to giue vppe his commission receiued of Christ, and to take another of the Kinge or Queene, and to charge him and his fellowe Apostles to leaue the true seruice which they had receiued, and to minister after an other sorte, as the Paliament lawe prescribeth.

To this I aunswere, we will bee tryed by the writinges of Peter and his fellow Apostles, that the Parliament lawe for Religion and seruice of God, concernig the substance the reof vrgeth not Peter to chaunge his commission, nor to vse any other seruice then they them selues haue taught vs to vse. If Augustine were aliue and in Englande, hee was a man of such modestie and loue of the trueth, that seeing the same plainly reuealed out of the holy Scriptures, hee would re-

tracte

tracte his errour of Prayer for the deade, as when hee lyued hee retracted and ſette foorth manye thinges, wherein he founde that he hadde erred. As for the fine of an hundred Markes, he woulde not haue lefte nor beene depriued of his Byſhoprike and impryſoned for ſaying of the popiſhe Maſſe, for hee neuer ſayde any in his life, but was an vtter enemye to the chiefe poyntes thereof, allowing nothing therof but prayer for the deade at the celebration of the Lords ſupper.

And for as our Sauiour Ieſus Chriſt, the King of all Kinges and Lorde of all Lordes, and the onely ruler of Heauen and earth, doe you thinke that hee wyll not complaine that hee onely by Parliament lawe is acknoweledged to bee the heade of his vniuerſall Church, and ſo continually preſent therewith by his holy ſpirit, that he neede no viear generall of a mortall manne, which canne occupye but one place, although he were neuer ſo diligent and painfull to diſcharge his dutie in that behalfe.

For his diuine and ſpirituall authoritie, is not excluded vnder the name of forraine power, as Briſtowe not more ſlaunderouſly then ridiculouſly affirmeth. Yet hee pleaſeth him ſelfe ſo much in ſo greate folly and madneſſe, that hee ſayth, Chriſte coulde not clayme to be heade of his Church, excepte he ſhould clayme to be the naturall Kinge of Englande, and to haue ſayde vnto Pylate, My kingdome is of this world and thy maiſter Cæſar doth me wronge. As though the King of Englande, by title of his royall power, clayming to be the chiefe Seruaunte or deputie of Chriſte, in gouerning his Churche according to his worde, did exclude the ſoueraignitie of Chriſte which he hath ouer his Church and elect, whereſoeuer they are vpon the face of the earth.

But the Proteſtantes (ſayth Briſtowe) *are contrary to themſelues while they ſay that our Prince is Kinge of France aſwel as of England and Ireland & yet ſay not that he*

is heade of the Church of Fraunce, but onely of the Church of England and Irelande. And is Bristowe such a profound Logitian that he cannot distinguishe a Kinge in right onely, from a King in actuall gouerment. If our Prince had as good possession of the gonernmente of Fraunce, as hee hath title of right to haue it, hee shall be gouernour of the Church of Fraunce, as well as of the Church of Englande and Ireland. That hee sayth we haue beene from hence at the Apostles going so long a iorney without any footing, in the way, it is a foolish cauel for wee haue often shewed succession of doctrine, euen from the Apostles from whome it is receiued.

The 43. Motiue is parte of the 47. demaunde.

Bristow. *Communion of Saintes. Christendom shut out of England by Parliament. Councels. Saincte Paule might not write ad Anglos for the Parliament.*

Fulke. The Chnrch of Englande is not so straythened or pinched within the lymites of one Kingdombut that she beleeueth and inioyeth the communion of all the Saincte̅s of God, as a member of the vniuersal church of Christe. And therefore I meruail what collour Bristowe hath for those slaunders: that one Christian man in Englande in spirituall affayres is a straunger to another, that generall Councels haue no authoritie in it, that Saincte Paule or all the Apostles if they were lyuing might not write to the Englishmen aswell as to the Romaines, Galathians, Corinthians &c. that Christe without the consente of the Kinge and the Parliament might not dispose his owne Church. These vaine and impossible suppositions, could not come but from a grosse and foolish inuention of one that lacketh argumentes to proue his cause. The lawes are made accor-

cording to that which is, namely the trueth, ſet foorth in the holy Scriptures, not according to that which euery foole will fondly ſuppoſe or imagine.

The 44. Motiue is the 49. demaund.

The Church that all Chriſtes enemies fight againſt. England ioyneth with Chriſtes enemyes againſte Chriſtendome. What Religion the Iewes impunge as the Religion of Chriſt. Chriſt is to bee beleeued for converting of Emperours and powers from their Idols to ſerue his ſeruauntes. The Church is euerlaſting and viſible. Saincte Auguſtines motiue. Emperors turned from their Idols and praying at Peeters ſepulchre, and the Chriſtianitie of humane lawes. Saincte Auguſtine of our Religion, Proteſtants bee of many olde hereſies. Briſtowe

The popiſh Church was not perſecuted by the heathen Emperous, but the Catholike church of Chriſt, The popiſh Church is not of ſo great antiquitie, that ſhee had then any thewe in the worlde, although the miſterie of iniquitie did then woorke and euen in the Apoſtles time. The Heathens, Turks aed Iewes, doe no more hate the popiſh church, then they doe the church of God which is in England. The warres againſt the Turke be at this day maintained by the ſtates of Germany, which are of our religiō aſwel as by the Papiſts, That there is no publike ayde ſent againſt the Turk out of England, it is not in any allowaunce of Turkiſh religion but becauſe the ſtate ſeeth it not neceſſary neither was there any publike ayde ſente an hundreth yeeres before the reuolte from Papiſtrie. And yet euen in the Queenes maieſties raigne, there hath gone ayd: out of England againſt Soliman which died at the ſiege of Segeſto, where diuers noble Gentlemen of Englande goinge on their owne charges as Bizia teſtifieth wan more true glory then they that 2. or 3. hundred yeeres before vpon a ſuperſtitious vowe were ſigned with the Fulke.

crosse to fight against the Saracens, for the possession of the earthly Ierusalem. How often shall I aunswer, that the first christian Emperours were not conuerted from Idolatry to Christianitie by the popish Church, but the later Christian Emperours, by her haue bene peruerted from the true worship of God, vnto Idolatry. That the Emperours being conuerted from Idolatry, did pray at Peter the fishermans sepulchre (as Augustine sayth) it sheweth the vertue of ỹ Gospel of Christ that had made so great alteration in them, but nothing at all proueth the authoritie or any error of the popish Church, for Augustine sayth not that they prayed vnto Peter, but at the sepulcher of Peter, meaning in the Church that was builded vpon the place, that was supposed to be the buriall of Peter. The lawes that those Emperours made against Idolaters, may well serue against the Papistes, w̃ are as grosse in all kindes of Idolatry as the Gentills for the most part were. Finally it was not ỹ popish Church, but the Church of Christ, that suppressed the heresies of the Arrians, Sabellians, Nestorians &c. But Iouinian did let out of hell Priestes and Nunnes mariage, which gate not the Church of Protestantes, but our Church (sayth Bristow) hath stopped. The Church that striued against Iouinian, was nether for mariage of Priestes, of whom many thowsands were maryed in that tyme, yea and a thowsande yeares after, nor yet for mariage of such as had vowed virginitie, and could not contayne, when both Epiphanius the hatchet of heresies, and Hierome that greatest aduersary of Iouinian, agree that they ought to marye. *Epiph. cont. Apostolicos hær. 61. Hierom ad Demetriadem.*

Nether were Epiphanius, Philaster, and Augustine, which disalow the opinion of Ærius, concerning prayers for the dead, members of the popish church, for this one error which they held, seeing they hold the principall substance of religion against the Papists, and agreeable to the word of God. That Bristow sayth in the demaund, *We count Turkes, Iewes, and very Atheistes for our frendes*

frendes and all that be not Papistes, it is a most detestable slaunder. The Anabaptistes burned in Smithfield were no Papistes, the blasphemer of Christ lately burned at Norwiche was no Papist, whose sharpe execution sheweth, that heretikes, blasphemers, and Atheistes, when they are discouered, finde no friendship at the handes of Christes Church, but such as they deserue. Finally the Easterne Church, which of long tyme hath bene separated from the Romish communion, hath as great enemies of the Turkes, heathen and Iewes, as the Popish Church hath, yet will not the Papistes allow it for the Catholike Church.

The 45. motiue conteyneth the 31. 32. & 33. & 40. demaundes.

Euer visible and Catholike, Vniuersalitie. Antiquitie. Consent. Protestants were neuer before this tyme. They are ashamed of their fathers. Hus was not a Protestant. Wicklefe was not a Protestant. Wicklefe condemned by Melanchon. Prophecy for our religion. No Scripture against the Catholikes but all for them. Bristowe

Here is nothing but the old popish bragge of vniuersalitie, antiquitie, and consent, which is as easily denied as it is allwayes alleaged without proofe. Sauing that in the demaundes, they are sundered, as though euery one of them without the other two, were a sufficient triall of truth, which nether Vincentius nor Optatus, nor Augustine, nor any that vsed this argument did euer meane. But that is truth, which being most auncient, hath at all tymes, of all true Christians, by general consent bene receyued. But this can not be proued of any one error of poperye. For if any of these three be omitted, the argument is of no force to proue truth. All nations by generall consent embraced Idolatrie. yet was the true worship of God which was knowen onely in Iurye Fulke.

the more auncient. The worship of Iupiter was more auncient, then the honor of Christ shewed in the flesh, and more vniuersally receyued, but not of the true worshippers of God. As for generall councells, which in the demaund of consent, he sayth to be all against the Protestants, he is not able to shewe one approued generall councel, that was held within six hundreth yeares after Christ, that decreed any thing contrary to that which we beleue in any poynt. But confessing that in many ages some there haue bene in some poyntes of our opinion, yet he sayth we can shewe no lyneall succession, but leape from Luther to Christ, without any recorde of our religion in all the meane tyme, hauing no monument of such Church nether in leafe or lyne of seruice booke: As one that loueth antiquities well, I would fayne see, what leaues the Papistes can shewe of their seruice bookes, to proue a lyneall descent from Christ to Pope Gregory the 13. when Bristow sweareth perdie, to agree in all poyntes with Pope Leo the tenth, which was in Luthers tyme, some of their seruice being made by Thomas Aquinas, some by Fulbertus, some taken out of Beda, some out of Gregory, some out of Augustine, some out of Hieronyme, some out of Iohn Chrysostom, and of Ambrose, and the eldest I thinke not of Origen: which argueth nether antiquitie nor vniuersalitie to stand with the popish seruice. as for lyneall succession from Christ, it is vnpossible for them to shewe.

But Bristow wil proue, that we were neuer before this time. For as for AErius, he knoweth we are ashamed of him. But he will proue that nether Hus, nor Wicklefe were Protestants. Because they held some opinions, that we doe not. By the same reason he may proue, that the fathers of the councels of Constance and Basil were no Papists, because they tooke vpon them to depose Popes and decreed that the councell was aboue the Pope, which most Papistes at this day dare not affirme. AEneas Syluius doth slaunder Wicklefe and Hus, that for euery mortall sinne a Magistrate should lose his office,

for

for their Apologies are extant to be ſeene to the contrary.

But Luther (ſayth he) denyeth that he was an Huſſite, affirming that Hus was not of his opinió. Although he had bene in all poyntes of his opinion, as he was in the chiefe, yet might Luther iuſtly deny the name of a man, which is proper to ſectaries as Franciſcanes, Dominicanes &c, & not to Chriſtians. Yet Wicklefe (ſayth he) is condemned by Melanthon. How I pray you? Firſt that he found many errors in him, by which iudgement might be made of his ſpirite. If Wicklefe liuing in a time of ſo great blindnes and darkenes, coulde not ſee the truth in all matters, it was no maruell, and that he had errors, he ſheweth that he was a man, euen as the beſt writers of the Church ſince the Apoſtles tyme, which might be deceyued: But as we condemne not Auguſtine, Hierom, Chryſoſtom, Cyprian, and other auncient writers, becauſe we know they erred in ſome things, no more haue we iuſt cauſe to condemne Wicklefe for ſome errors which it is not vnlike, but he did holde, yea but Melanthon chargeth Wicklefe (ſayth he) to be altogether ignoraunt of the righteouſnes of faith, which is the foundation of religion. I will rather thinke that Melanthon was ignoraunt of Wickleſes opinion, as one which had not ſeene but fewe of his workes. In which as perhaps he might vſe the tearmes of merit and deſeruing, then commonly vſed in his tyme, yet that he had not the ſame meaning in them, but did well vnderſtand and holde the righteouſnes which is of fayth, I can playnely proue by his owne writings in diuerſe places. As vpon the *Heb.* 10. he ſayth: *Sith Chriſt is God and man, ſatisfaction for the ſinne that he made thus freely, is better then any other that man or Angell might make. The ſame man in nowmber that ſinned in Adam our firſt fadir, the ſame man in nowmber made aſſeeth by the ſecond Adam Chriſt. And ſith he is more of vertue then the firſt Adam might be, and his payne is much more then ſinneſull luſt of the firſt Adam, who ſhoulde haue conſcience here, that*

"*ne this ſinne is clanſid all out. And ſith our Ieſu is very God*
"*that neuer man forfete this mede, he is a ſufficient medicine*
"*for all ſinners that bene contrite, for Chriſt is euer and eue-*
"*ry where, and in all ſuch ſoules by grace, and ſo he clan-*
"*ſeth more cleanely then any bodye or figure may clenſe, and*
"*herefore as Poule ſayth, Chriſt is mediator of the newe*
"*lawe, &c.* Agayne vpon 2. *Cor.* 3. *Seeth mans thinking a-*
"*monge his werkes, ſeemeth moſte in his power, and yet his*
"*thought mote come of God, much more eche other werke of*
"*man &c. Thus ſhould we put of pride and wholly truſten in*
"*Ieſu Chriſt, for he that may not thinke of him ſelfe, may doe*
"*nought of him ſelfe, but all our ſufficiencie is of God by the*
"*meane of Ieſu Chriſt.* Likewiſe vpon the 8. to the Ro-
manes. *Sith God ſufferyneth man and moueth him and hel-*
"*peth him for to trauell, how had it not come of grace, and*
"*thus reward of this trauell mote needes all come of grace.*
Theſe places and many other ſhewe that Wicklefe was not ignorant of the righteouſnes of fayth. It ſeemeth therefore that Melanchon had ſeene only the articles which his aduerſaries had gathered againſt him, and not his owne writings and diſcourſes.

The prophecyes, which Briſtow boaſteth to be for their religion, be of Ieremye and Eſay, for the perpetuall continuance of the true Church of Chriſt, but ſeing it is proued that the popiſh Church hath not bene from the beginning, thoſe prophecyes appertayne not vnto her. How the Church is viſible, is ſhewed in the 37. motiue. whereunto I adde, that while the Papiſtes glory of a viſible Church on earth, Ieruſalem that is aboue, and therefore not ſubiect to the eyes of earthly men, but of ſuch whoſe conuerſation is in heauen, is the mother of vs all. Finally if Briſtow coulde as truly proue, as he doth boldly ſay, that no Scripture is againſt them, but all for them, he ſhoulde haue no Proteſtants to be his aduerſaries, who more accept of the authoritie of the holy Scriptures, then of all other motiues in the world.

The 46. motiue is the 39. demaund.

VVhere grewe the Proteſtants ſeede before our time. The church hath reheaꝛſed wedneſday faſt long ſithence. A Biſhop is aboue a Prieſt. The Saincts were of our religion. Baptiſme neceſſarie for ſaluation of children. Anabaptiſts. VVhy there be ſo many Atheiſtes in England. Trinitaries. Briſtow.

Such ſeedes of our doctrine (ſayth Briſtowe) as haue growne before this time, did alwayes growe in euell grounde, namely in heretikes as denyall of prayer for the deade in Ærius, who beſide that errour was an Arrian. He chargeth vs alſo with denying the ordinarie faſt of the church, but that is falſe. For we hold that the faſt which is appointed by the church, ought to be obſerued, although we hold that no man is bounde to the blaſphemous, ſuperſtitious, and counterfait faſt of the Popiſh ſynagogue. In that time in which Ærius liued, there were other times of faſting appointed, then ſuch as the Popiſhe church obſerueth. *But the wedſneſday faſt* (ſayth Briſtowe) *the church hath releaſed.* In what generall councell good Sir: are you able to ſhewe: likewiſe of other times of faſt named in Epiphanius? if you be not able to ſhew this where is either your vniuerſalitie, antiquitie, or ſucceſſion in doctrine and diſcipline, without interruption. Fulke.

More thé this (ſayth he) Ærius did hold, that a Biſhop & a Prieſt be equall, which alſo the Proteſtãts do mainteyne. In preaching the word and miniſtring the Sacramentes. S. Hierom Euagrio is of the ſame opinion that they are equall likewiſe in *Epiſt. ad Titum. cap.* 1. ſhewing that a Biſhoppe is preferred before a Prieſt *magis eccleſiæ conſuetudine quam diſpoſitionis dominicæ veritate* rather by cuſtome of the church to auoyde ſchiſmes, then by truth of the Lordes diſpoſition. Furthermore one of the Proteſtantes ſeedes is, that we muſt not pray to Saints,

but this was held of certayne heretikes in S. Bernardes time who were called Apostolici & were also Anabaptistes, denying the baptisme of infantes. The conclusion is, that these opinions can not be good, because they are founde in some heretikes. And the contrary opinion must needes be true, because they are found in some holy men, as in S. Athanasius, Epiphanius, Augustine.&c. Although these opinions are but fewe in comparison of so many articles of religion, in whiche we dissent from the Papistes, which if they coulde be founde in heretikes, we should soone heare of them: yet what Logike is in this conclusion of Bristow, you shall see by examples of the like, and euen of the same heretikes. Ærius, as Augustine reporteth out of Philastre, did also receiue into his felowship none but suche as wete continent, and had so renounced the worlde, that they possessed nothing in common, likewise they abstayned from flesshe. The very same doth Bernarde report of the heretikes called Apostolike, that they rereuerenced mariage, and abstayned from all flesh and whitemeates. *In canti. ser. 66.* This diuelishe seede prophecied before to be the note of Antichristian hypocrites, grew in many heretikes before the time of the Papistes, and not these only, but many other also. Worshipping of Images in Carpocratians *Ep. 1. lib. 1. T. 2. prefat. contr. Gnostic. 27. 29.*

The superstitious estimacion of the crosse in the Valentinians *Epiph. Ho 31.* Transubstantiation of the wine into blood in Marcus and the Marcosians Irenæus *lib. 1 cap. 9.* Prayer for the deade in the Montanistes. *Tert. de Monon. & de Anima. &c.* Inuocation of Angells in the Caianites and many other Popishe plantes were first sowne by the deuill in elder heretikes. And yet were this no good argument to confute these opinions or errors, because they are founde in heretikes, except they were found to be contrarie to the word of God. All is no heresie, whatsoeuer an heretike hath affirmed, for there was neuer heretike, but affirmed much truth, neither is

all

all truth that is affirmed by euery Sainct and holy man, for not one of the ancient writers but is acknowledged to haue affirmed ſome vntruth. Only the holy Scripture ought to haue this preheminence, as Auguſtine ſayth, that it may iudge of all ſayings and writings, it ſelfe being iudged of none, becauſe it is the word of God which can not erre or be deceaued. *Cont. Creſcon. gram. lib. 2. cap. 31.* But Briſtowe hath Scripture to proue that he which denyeth prayer for the dead, being found among the Arrians & Anabaptiſts, can not chooſe but be boũd in bundells with them and caſt into the fire. *Mat. 13.* In deede he that is an Arrian or Anabaptiſt ſhal not eſcape for denying prayer for the deade. But the Angells that are the reapers, are not ſo vnſkilfull, but that they can diſcerne true Chriſtians denying the abuſe of prayers for the dead, which the Scripture doth not admit, from blaſphemous heretikes, among a great number of falſehoodes affirming ſome truth.

But it is a ſore matter, that he ſayth, *The verie worſt ſorte of heretikes of this time, as the Anabaptiſtes, Trinitaries, yea the verie Epicures and Atheiſtes, were firſt Proteſtantes, ye ſuch they be and will ſeeme to be ſtill.* He had ſpoken more truly, if he had ſayd they were firſt Papiſtes. But what heretikes and Atheiſtes woulde ſeeme to be, it is no diſhonor to our cauſe, ſeeing all hypocrits would ſeeme to be true Chriſtians. That only Papiſtes are troubled in our countrie, and all other ſectes tollerated and mainteyned the publike execution and puniſhment of Anabaptiſtes and other blaſphemous ſectes as the Familie of Loue &c. doth playnly proue to be falſe, and Briſtow to be a ſhameleſſe ſlaunderer.

The 47. motiue is the 50. demaund.

Sure to continue. The church is euerlaſting and viſible. Briſtow. Proteſtants do decay and ſhall come to nothing. The churches

continuaunce. S. Augustines motiue. England beware destruction. Luther was a false Prophet.

I neede not to shewe, how often and how vainly Bristowe repeateth one thing, to make a great number of motiues. The euerlasting continuaunce of the true church hath bene seuen times at least before alleaged. But neither is it proued that the Popish church is that true church, nor yet that any sect or companie which shall continewe to the ende of the worlde is the Catholike church of Christ. For although Antichrist is and shall be more and more consumed with the breath of the Lordes mouth, which is his holie worde yet shall he not be altogether abolished vntill the ende of the worlde. Yea at the ende of the worlde, as our Sauiour Christ sayeth, fayth shall be verie scant, and hard to be founde, and iniquitie shall haue the vpper hande. Therefore there shall be a great church of malignant hypocrytes euen to the ende of the worlde. It is true therefore, that Christes church is sure to continewe but not whatsoeuer sect shall continew, is thereby proued to be Christes true church. How vayne his bragge is, that Protestantes doe decaye: and shall come to nothing, by their dayly increase in all partes of the world, God be thanked may be seene to all men. Likewise how true it is, which he affirmeth that Papistes doe increase, and to such numbers euen in Englande that there are more Papistes nowe, then when the Gospell was first preached, (notwithstandinge so many yeares preaching of vs and large silence of them) who liuing in Englande can be ignoraunt? I confesse there are too many obstinate Papistes in Englande whome none of Bristowes motiues, hath either moued vnto Poperie, or confirmed therein, but onely great tolleration and lenitie which is vsed in these times. But if such seueritie were vsed nowe, as in times past, the Pope shoulde not haue many confessors in Englande to glorie of. And to say the truth, what one of these Papistes, dare

profesſe

profeſſe what he thinketh of the Popes auctoritie, becauſe the lawe is ſomewhat ſharpe in that poynt. If the like lawe were of hearing maſſe we ſhould haue as fewe ſuffer for maſſe as for the ſupremacie. But to returne to our motiue S. Auguſtine doth well to ſend Honoratus the Manichee to followe that way of Catholike doctrine which from Chriſt him ſelfe by the Apoſtles is deſcended vnto vs, and from hence to poſteritie ſhall deſcende. *De vtilit. cred. cap.* 8. But that it is not the way of all Popiſh doctrine which neuer came from Chriſt, nor his Apoſtles, nor the moſt auncient church. And if the tradition be vncerteyne, how ſhall we know what came from Chriſt and his Apoſtles, but that which we finde in the Goſpell of Chriſt and the Epiſtles of his Apoſtles.

But the ſame Auguſtine (ſayeth Briſtow) biddeth the ſimple Donatiſtes to *Number the Prieſtes euen from the verie ſeate of Peter, and in that order of fathers ſee, who to whom ſucceeded. That ſame is the rocke which the prowde gates of Hell doe not ouercome P.S. contra Donatiſtas.* Auguſtine ſpeaketh of the Catholike church, which was the vine, whereof the Church of Rome at that tyme was but a growing braunch. For a litle before he ſayth, *Sciris Catholica quid ſit, & quid ſit preciſum a vite.* You knowe what the Catholike church is, and what is that which is cut of from the vine. But if Briſtowe ſhoulde vrge the ſeate of Peter to be called of Auguſtine the rocke, Auguſtine in his retractations confeſſeth that he oftentimes hath expounded the rocke to be Chriſt, and ſo will not abide by that former expoſition *Retract. lib.* 1. *cap.* 21. Neither did Auguſtine euer meane that the ſee of Peter at Rome was a rocke in ſuch ſorte, that none that euer ſhould ſit there, coulde erre, for he him ſelfe, with the reſt of the fathers of the councell of Carthage withſtood ỹ Biſhop of Rome, claiming iuriſdictiõ in Africa by coullour of a coũterfet decree of the councell of Nice. *Conc. Carth. 6. cap. 4. Concil. Aphr Ep. ad Celeſt.* what ſhoulde I heere repeate Pope Honorius condem-

ned for an heretike, not only in the generall councell of Conſtantinople the 6. but alſo in the Idolatrous coũcell of Nice the 2. and Iohn the 23. condemned for an Atheiſt in the councell of Gonſtance. If the gates of hell preuayled not manifeſtly againſt that ſeate, yea and ſo many other Biſhoppes thereof, whom they them ſelues confeſſe to be damned in hell for their wicked life: we neede not greatly be affrayed of the gates of hell. Yea (ſayth Briſtow) *It hath bene impugned ten thouſand times more then any other, but all in vayne, fruſtra circumlatrantibus hæreticis ſayth S. Auguſtine. In vayne is the barking of heretikes all about it. De vtil cred. cap.* 17. But the place of Auguſtine which he citeth, is of the Church of Chriſt and not of Peters ſeate, round about the which, the heretikes haue barked in vaine. For euen in that ſeate, but yet out of the Church, Liberius had barked Arrianiſme, Marcellus gentiliſme, and after his time Honorius barked with the Monothelits as his epiſtle which remayned after his death declared. Vigilius alſo by his epiſtle was proued to barke Eutychianiſme, *Liberat. cap.* 22. Iohn the 23. barked with the Sadduces againſt the reſurrection of the dead, *cont. Conſtanti. ſect.* 11. The ſee of Rome therefore is no more the rocke againſt which the gates of hell ſhall not preuaile, then the ſee of Canterbury or London. But ſayth Briſtowe who can ſaye that there ſhall be alwayes a Byſhoppe of Canterburye or London? Verely, no more can any man ſaye, that there ſhall alwayes bee a Byſhop of Rome. And whoſoeuer ſayth, that there hath beene alwayes ſince Peter a Byſhop of Rome, ſhall lye moſte impudently. For the See hath often lyen voyde, not onely for a ſhorte time, while a newe Byſhop might be choſen: but many yeers togither. Againe the See hath beene tranſlated from Rome to Auinion, and the Popes Court kepte there for threeſcore yeeres togither by which it is manifeſt both that the Citie of Rome hath not beene the perpetuall See of Peters ſucceſſours, and that Peters ſucceſſors haue erred in remouing their Courte from that Citie,

which

which Peter choſe to be heade of the worlde and Conſtantine gaue (as they ſay) to be the head of the church, which might haue forborne ſo great a gift like as Peter alſo might haue ſpared his trauell in remouing his ſee from Antioch to Rome, if they coulde haue foreſeene that the Popes court might haue bene kept as well in Fraunce, as in Italie, at Auinion as at Rome.

But Luther is charged to be a falſe Prophet, for that he ſayth in his booke againſt King Henry, That he was " ſure that he had his doctrines from heaue. That his do- " ctrine ſhould ſtand and the Pope ſhould fall. That God " ſhould ſee whether firſt be wery and faile, the Pope or " Luther. The note of a falſe Prophet in Deu. 18 is to geue " a ſigne which doth not follow, & ſo hath Luther doone ſayth Briſtow. For Zwinglius hath ouercome Luther & Caluine Zwinglius and the Puritans the Proteſtants in England. To this I aunſwere, that Luther doth not take vpon him to foreſhew things to come by any ſpeciall reuelatiõ, but only affirmeth that his doctrine in as much as it is agreable to the word of God, is from heauen, & ſhall continewe, whereas the Popes doctrine being the doctrine of the deuill ſhall come to naught. And in this victorie, (if he pleaſe ſo to tearme it) hath not the Pope loſte by preuayling of Zwinglius and Caluine. And was that opinion of Luther which they haue impugned, I meane of the carnall preſence Luthers or the Popes? But whereas ỳ ſlanderous hypocrite, would make men think, that Caluine hath oppoſed himſelfe againſt the doctrine of Zwinglius, the cõſent of the churches of Heluetia ẅ them of Sabaudia being publikely ſet forth to the worlde, doth openly teſtifie the contrarie. Alſo the contention of thoſe whom he calleth Puritanes in Englande, is not ſo great, nor about ſo great matters, that any ſuch diuiſion is to be feared, which might cauſe deſolation of the kingdome. Adde hereunto that Briſtow ſayd in the 40. motiue, that the Proteſtantes of England be in a manner all in heart Puritanes, whereby he confeſſeth againſt him ſelfe, that there can be no

deadly contention betwene them, that in heart are all one.

The 48. motiue.

Brifton. *How to make playne demonſtration that the heretikes haue no euidence & that we haue all. VVho be wreſters of the Scriptures. The inconſtancy of the Proteſtants: The vnderſtanding of the Scriptures is in the church.*

Fulke. This wiſe demonſtration is a playne declaration, that he which made it, knoweth not what a demonſtration meaneth, but ſuch as it is, let vs ſee what is in it.

Firſt he would haue it proponed by a Catholike, to his frend that is an heretike, to be conſidered, ſeing al theſe motiues beginning with holy Scripture, approued traditions &c. be for them & agai ſt vs, what is the cauſe that we cry ſo ſhameleſly & deceitfully: the Goſpel, the word of the Lorde, the touchſtone of Gods booke? And leaſt we ſhoulde ſay, that he beginneth with a falſe ſuppoſed & ſhameful begging of the principle, he will proue that all theſe euidences are for them, *and ſo muſt the heretike that you wil deale withall be made in the beginning to cõfeſſe.* Yea Sir, but howe will you driue him to this confeſſion? Forſooth ſayth Briſtow, they all confeſſe it many wayes indirectly. Firſt in *that they vſe not the ſame euidences them ſelues, in their declarations.* Secondly in *that they admit no euidence but only Scripture.* To the firſt I anſwere they vſe as much of this euidence, as is good & agreable to the holy Scripture. To the ſecond I ſay, that if only Scripture be on our ſide it is more then all the reſt againſt the Scripture, and againe if only Scripture be on our ſide, then al the motiues be not on their ſide, for Scripture is one of them, the 8. in the motiues the firſt in the demaundes. But the Papiſt *muſt make his frend ſay as much directly or els ſay expreſſely to euery one of them whether he will be tried by them.* As a frende to the preſones, though

an enemie to the errours of ſuch Papiſtes as are curable. I haue ſayd expreſſely and particularly to euerie one of them, ſheweing whether it be a true and proper note of the church, and if it be, that it belongeth to vs and not to them. Although Briſtow ſay, *that this way we know full well that they ſhall haue the victorie flying therefore euermore to our weake & falſe caſtle of only Scripture.* That the ſcripture onely is our caſtle, we do gladly admitte, but that the ſame is a moſt ſtrong true & impugnable caſtle, none but a blaſphemous heretike will deny. *But you muſt* (ſaith Briſtow) *ſtill labour to get them (& if you can) with their conſent, out of the caſtle into the plaine fieldes aforeſayde, to make them graunt expreſſely that there in your handes they can not ſtande.* Nay Briſtow you muſt beate vs from our caſtell if you can, for we will neuer conſent to goe out of it for defenſe, except it be to offer you the aduauntage, not in the playne fieldes as you cal it, but among your pettie piles and ſmall holdes. And ſo we haue done often. So did that reuerende father the Biſhoppe of Saliſburie, in that noble challenge wherein you were ſhamefullie foyled in your owne grounde and many of your fortes beaten about your eares. But you doe not well to teach your ſchollers to ſeeke a gentle aduerſarie to fight withall, which muſt firſt of all be willing to laye downe his ſworde and ſhielde and then you are good enough for him with your manlie motiues with which when you haue treandled him about like a tenis ball, you ſende him backe agayne to his caſtell of onely Scripture, to ſee whether they will beare him out in his opinions. For example, is not this Scripture manifeſt inough on your ſide and agaynſt vs? *This is my body. This is my blood? Mat. 26.* Verily euen as plaine as this. They did all eate the ſame ſpirituall meate. They all dronke of the rocke that followed thē & ỹ rocke was Chriſt. 1. Cor. 10. They are both one maner of ſpeaking, and both of one matter. Therefore they haue both one meaning. The ſecond exāple is. By works a man is iuſtified & not by faith only *Iac. 2.* And this is alſo Scripture,

knowing that a man is not iuſtified by the workes of the Lawe, but by faith of Ieſus Chriſt *Galat.* 2. And agayne by grace you are ſaued through faith (and that not of your ſelues it is the gift of God) not of workes leaſt any man ſhoulde boaſt. The later being in maner of ſpeaking contrarie to the former text doe playnly ſhewe, that theſe two Apoſtles, ſpeake not both of one kinde of faith or iuſtification. But that Iames ſpeaketh of a dead faith as his wordes are playne *Verſ.* 17. and of iuſtification before men. Paule of a liuing faith and of iuſtification in the ſight of God. The third example is out of Iames 5. Where I muſt firſt note, that Briſtow in tranſlation doth manifeſtly corrupt & falſefie the Scripture. The Latine is, *Infirmatur quis in vobis? If any amongeſt you be daungerouſly ſicke let him ſend for the Prieſts of the church and they to pray ouer him anealing him with oyle in the name of our Lord &c.* Firſt Briſtow addeth this word daungerouſly of his owne heade, which is neither in the Greeke nor vulgare Latine text, to draw the text of Iames violently, to their popiſh greaſing which they vſe only when a man is deſperatly ſicke, and paſt hope of recouerie in their iudgement. Whereas Iames ſpeaketh generally, of any kinde of ſickenes, wherewith any of the faithfull were moleſted. Secondly Briſtowe leaueth out the wordes following, which are theſe and the prayer of faith ſhall ſaue the ſicke perſon and the Lord ſhall reſtore him or raiſe him vp, the Latine is alleuiabit ſhall eaſe him, which wordes declare, that the Apoſtle ſpeaketh not of a perpetuall Sacrament of the church, but of a ceremonie vſed by them that had a ſpeciall gift of healing the ſicke in the primitiue Churche whiche ceremonie muſt needes ceaſe, with the gift except it be among apes, that practiſe outward geſture and actions, without effect. The other two examples out of the 2. of Machabees the one of praying for the deade, the other of Ieremie praying for the people, are no partes of the caſtell of Canonicall Scripture, and therefore with other errours in the ſame bookes I omit them. The

laſt

last exãple is out of Genesis 48. The saying of Iacob the Patriarke of Iosephs two childrẽ. God who hath fed me from my youth euen to this day: The Angell who hath deliuered me out of all aduersities, blesse these children which is (sayth Bristow) *as if one would say, God and our Ladie blesse them.* Nay rather God by Iesus Christ blesse them, for what other Angell but Christ the Angell of the great councell was the deliuerer of Iacob, which when he wrestled with him in a vision and mystery *Gen.* 32. he doubted not to call God. Euen the same Angell which led the children of Israel through the wildernes, whõ S. Paul 1. Cor. 10. calleth Christ, who was not an Angel by nature but by office, & in that as the Mediator he was sent to deliuer the people before he came in the flesh. But if we should vnderstand, the Angell of whom Iacob speaketh, for sõe priuate Angel, appointed of God to protect him, yet is it not as if one would say now God & our Lady blesse thẽ. For that God vseth the ministery of Angels to defend & prosper his seruaunts, but not the ministery of Saincts in heauẽ, for any such purpose that we can learne by the holy Scriptures. Iacob might therfore pray ỳ God would send his Angell to protect those children, euen as he had done for him. As for that vaine brag that all Scripture from the beginning of Genesis to the end of the Apocalipse is for thẽ & against vs, is nothing els but a false alarme, as though he woulde on all sides assalt our castel of only Scriptures, wheras he purposeth nothing lesse. But this can not be borne, that he sayeth some places of Scripture be so playne against vs, that we can not aunswere them but by plucking the pen of the holy Ghost out of his hand that wrote thẽ meaning that we deny the auctority of such books as be not Canonicall the Machabees especially. But this he sayth can not be, *For either they are proued inuincibly to be of the holy Ghostes indighting, or no Scripture at all is proued to be suche as you may remember the common saying of S. Augustine. Ego Euangelio non crederem &c. I shoulde not beleue the Gospell it selfe vnlesse the Catholike Churches auctoritie*

did compell. What ſhall I ſay to this impudent blaſphemer that alloweth none other tryall of holy Scripture but the authoritie of rhe Church, becauſe Auguſtine ſuppoſing that hee were an Heathen, Againe (ſayth he would not beleeue the Goſpell except the authoritie of the Church, with other thinges did moue him: his woorde is *Commoueret* whiche Briſtowe not ſo ignorauntly as impudently tranſlateth *did compel mee.* But the Catholike Church (ſaith Briſtow) hath receiued theſe bookes of equall authoritie with the reſt. Indeede the Synagogue of Antichriſt in the Tridentine councell hath ſo decreede. But the Catholike Church of Chriſt did neuer receiue them, as I haue ſhewed out of Hieronime. *præf in Prouerb.* and others whereto I may adde the iudgement of Origine out of Euſebhiſt: *lib. 6. cap. 18. tran. Ruff.* with the councell o Laodicea. *Can. 59.*

Marke the plaineneſſe of this demonſtration, when the queſtion & cõtrouerſie is, whether they or we be the chuch. All ſcriptur is for them & againſt vs becauſe the church that is, they haue thus & thus decrede, No meruail therfore if Briſtow appeale to the iudgmẽt of indifferent mẽ, that al our prating of ỹ ſcriptures is nothing elſe but as S. Peter ſaith of S. Paules Epiſtles) our wreſting and writhing of them by our owne vnlearnednes & vnſtablenes, from the Catholike Churches vnitie and vniuerſalitie to the ſciſme and peece of Luther, & from thẽce to Caluine &c For the Church is the ſetled and vnmoueable rock, againſt which ther is no ſcripture no trueth but all for it.

This is good a demonſtratiõ, as if a man ſhould ſay to a veſſel toſſed in the brode ſea with wind & waues, that in the hauen there is great reſt & ſecuritie, but not ſhew what courſe they ſhould keepe to come thither. We by the only true lodeſtone Pharos, and heauenly Cynoſura of the holy ſcriptures (we praiſe his holy name therfore) haue founde the moſte happy hauen of the holy Catholick Church of Chriſt, & by his helpe haue caſte out the Anchor of Faith ſo ſurely fixed not in the ſand,

but

but in the Hauen it ſelfe, that all the Cables of popiſhe motiues, or blaſts of Diueliſh doctrines ſhal not be able to ſtirre our ſhip from thence: which courſe God graūt them to keepe, who labouring in the ſea of doubtfulnes, ride not wilfully among the rocks of Romiſh pride, nor be obſtinately ſet on the ſands of mens traditions, but ſeeke trueth in humilitie to Gods glory & their ſafetie.

Beſids theſe motiues there are two demands which I cannot aptely reduce to any of the Motiues, namely the ſeconde which he termeth the building of the Church, and the laſte which hee calleth Apoſtaſie. In the former demaund he aſketh vs whether we haue not read this argument vſed by Chriſoſtome againſte the Painims and Iewes, that Chriſte is God, becauſe his Church hauing but a ſmall beginning, & many ſtronge enemyes, to withſtand the building thereof, yet could or can neuer be ſuppreſſed, but contrariwiſe of a litle ſpark hath ſet all the world on fire &c. I anſwere, we haue read this argument, and allowe of it. Then ſayth Briſtowe, *How hath it beene theſe many hundreth yeeres quite ſuppreſſed, yea and in Chriſoſtomes time no Church at all* I anſwere that ſince it was firſt ſet vp, it was neuer for one houre quite ſuppreſſed, although by Antichriſte theſe many hundred yeeres it hath beene greatly oppreſſed. And in Chryſoſtomes time the Church did openly floriſhe, although infected with ſome errors, yet holding ſtrongly the only tradition Ieſus Chriſt, which church was a member of the ſame vniuerſall Church, whereof our Church at this day is a parte, with which Church in Chryſoſtoms time, the popiſh church in that it diſſēteth from vs, hath nothing cōmon except one or two errors, hauing the whole ſubſtance of doctrine contrary vnto it: wherefore that argument ſtāding, the popiſh church is nothing vnderpropped thereby: which though it had a ſmall beginning, as the ſect of Mahomet, yet grew it by ſufferance of God, without great withſtanding of ſtrong enemies, yea God ſending the effecacy of error, that it might preuaile. and yet hath not increaſed ouer all the

world, but is for the moſt part contained in one parte of Europa deminiſhing where it is puniſhed as in Germany, Sauoy, Denmarke, Swetia and Englande, growing onely where it is either mayntained by tyranny or tollerated by lenitie.

And now to the laſte demaund of Apoſtaſie, wherwith he chargeth vs. Firſte for chaunging the Prieſthoode, whereupon muſt inſue a chaunge of the law. To this I aunſwere, we haue chaunged no prieſthoode, inſtituted by God, but retaine that elderſhip and miniſtery ordayned by our Sauiour Chriſte. Contrarywiſe the Pope hath changed *Sacerdotium* (which Briſtowe confeſſeth to be no other thing then presbiteratum) which is the miniſtration of the Goſpel, yet commonly called both of him and vs Prieſthood, that Sacrificing prieſthood I ſay w̄ the Apoſtle He. 7. affirmeth to be euerlaſting and proper to the perſon of our Sauiour Chriſte, hath the Pope tranſlated vnto his ſhaueli gs, and ſette them vp to offer that Sacrifice which Chriſt only could offer, and by once offering found eternall redemption: yea the Prieſthood of Melchiſedech which the Lord by an othe confirmed only to our ſauiour Chriſt. Pſal. 100. Hee hath made common to all his Maſſemongers, Therfore the Pope hath manifeſtly made an Apoſtacy from the lawe of Chriſt.

The ſecond argument by which Briſtow would charge vs with Apoſtaſie is, *for receiuing not one or two, but ſo many olde hereſies, beſides as he is bolde to ſay a thouſand more of their owne inuention.* This beeing affirmed without all ſhew of proofe. It ſhall ſuffice to deny and turne ouer vnto him and his fellowes.

The third argument is *for taking from Chriſtian men, ſo many arguments of Chriſtes diuinitie, as the inuincible continuaunce and authoritie of his Church. The honor and vertue of croſſes and reliques, miracles, exorciſmes, vnitie, Sacrifice &c.* I aunſwere ſo many of theſe as are good and ſufficient argumentes, wee holde ſtill, the vnſufficient arguments doe rather diſforniſh then arme the Chriſtians

ſtians faith, which we haue ſo ſtrongly fortified with arguments out of the holy ſcriptures, that all the power of darkeneſſe cannot preuaile againſt it.

The fourth argument is, *for leauing nothing vndenyed, not Fathers, nor Councels, not Traditions, not Scriptures, nor (the onely witneſſe of all canonicall Scriptures) the Churches inſtitution, and departing from the Fathers of all ages ſince Chriſtes time, agreeing with no Chriſtian time, nor none with them.* For denying of canonicall Scriptures, it is an impudent ſlaunder, as for Fathers, Councelles, Traditions, Churches authoritie, we affirme or deny, as they agree or diſſagree with the trueth of the holye ſcriptures, the onely certaine witneſſe of the will of God reuealed vnto men, which we thinke more reaſonable then the Papiſtes doe, whiche denie, fathers, Councels, Traditions, yea the authoritie of the holy Scriptures, and ſubmit all vnto the iudgement of their Church, now when then the controuerſie is, whether they be the Church of God, or of the Deuill: whereas the Scriptures are of bothe partes confeſſed to be the worde of God in generall termes, although in compariſon of the authoritie of their Church, Piggius calleth the holy Scripture a noſe of Wax, and a dumbe iudge. Eccius tearmeth the written goſpel, a black Goſpel and an inkiſh diuinitie. Hoſius ſayth, that this commaundement of Chriſte, *Drinke ye all of this*, beeing vnderſtoode doth appertaine vnto laye men, contrary to their Churches determination, is the expreſſe worde of the Deuill. And for departing from the faith of the Fathers &c. I aunſwere it is falſe, there is but one true Faith of all true Chriſtians, in al times from which wee will neuer departe, although wee haue departed from ſome erroneous opinions of ſome fathers, which becauſe they are contrary to the woorde of God, by hearing whereof Faith commeth, they deſerue not the name of Faith.

Finally, whereas hee ſayth, the authoritie of the Church is the onely witneſſe of all canonicall Scrip-

Scriptures, it is vntrue. For although he should meane not the popish Sinagogue, but the true catholike church of Christ, yet is it not the onely witnesse of the Scriptures. For euen the Iewish Synagogue, is witnesse of the olde testament, and many sectes of heresies of all the scripture, beside that the spirit of God is the chiefe and principall witnes of all, which speaketh so euidently in all the canonical scripture, that if all mé on earth should refuse to giue credite vnto them, yet his maiestie alone is sufficient to get credite vnto them, especially with all those whome he teacheth inwardly in heart, as he speaketh sensibly to their eares.

The last argument is, *That in place of all Religion and goodnes which they haue renoued, deuising a new Gospel of their foresaid onely vaine fayth, which teacheth all sinnes & all heresies to presume of saluation.* What can bee more impudent or false then this slaunder, seeing God and the worlde knoweth, that wee teach none other Faith but the fayth of the Gospell, which worketh by loue, and promiseth remission of sinnes and saluation to none, but such as earnestly repent, and are willing to remoue all heresie, and to imbrace all true Christian Religion and goodnesse.

God be praysed.

A DISCOVERY OF THE DAVNGEROVS ROCKE OF THE POPISH CHVRCH,

lately commended by Nicholas Sanders D. in diuinitie, at which the Catholike Church of Christ hath bene in perill of shipwracke these many hundreth yeares,

By W. Fulke D. in diuinitie.

THE eternal rocke of the vniuersal Church, Christ was the rocke, an other foundation no man is able to put. 1. Cor. 3. & 10. *Saunder.*

The temporall rocke of the Militant Church: Thou art Peter & vpon this rocke I will build my Church. Mat. 16.

S. Paule speaketh manifestly 1. *Cor.* 3. of building of the Church Militant, and Christ *Mat.* 16. speaketh of an eternall rocke, against the which the gates of hell shall not preuayle. Therefore your distinction of eternall and temporall, vniuersall and militant, which is the foundation of all your rotten rocke is an impudent and blasphemous falshood. *Fulke.*

Of the continuance of your temporall rocke, it is in vaine to contende when your rocke is nothing els but an heape of sande and dunge whereon your popishe Church is builded.

To the right worshipfull M. Doctor Parker bearing the *Saunder.*

name of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and to all other Protestants in the Realme of England, Nicolas Sander wisheth perfect faith and charitie in our Lorde, declaring in this preface, that the Catholikes (whome they call Papistes) doe passe the Protestants, in all maner of signes or markes of Christes true Church.

Concerning the omission of titles accustomed to be giuen to the Archbishop of Canterbury, for which you excuse your selfe, I thinke M. D. Parker while he liued, did not much esteeme them giuen to him by any man, and least of all looked to receyue them at suche mens handes as you are: but touching the religion & church, whereof he was a minister, I will aunswer you in his behalfe and of all other ministers and members thereof, that no excuse will serue you, vpon so slender reasons as you bringe, to condemne the same of schisme and heresie, nor to defend that Synagogue of Satan, wherof you professe your selfe to be a Champion, to be the vndefiled Church and spouse of Christ. For thinke you M. Sanders, that we wil more mislike the Church of Christ persecuted by the hypocriticall crueltie of Antichrist for the space of 5. or 6. hundreth yeares before our age, then we do the same, persecuted by the furious rage of Heathenish tyrantes, for 300. yeares after the first planting of the same amonge the Gentills. And thinke you if we are now to learne, that all that glory and bright shining of Christes Church promised by the Prophets, is spirituall and not carnall, heauenly and not earthly, eternal & not transitory? Or that we know not your synagogue to be the very contrary kingdome and sea of Antichrist, euen by that outward glory, and glistering pompe of open shewe, that you boast of, according to the prophecy of Christ in the reuelation? *Apoc.* 13. & 17. And as for the citie built vpon an hill, whereof you haue neuer doone babling, by the playne context of the Gospel, is not the whole Church, but euery true pastor and minister thereof, who are also the light of the worlde, the

salt

salt of the earth, and a candle set on a candlestick, to giue light, not hiden vnder a bushell to be vnprofitable. *Mat.* 5. And Christ hath alwayes bene with his Church, although the Church of Rome be departed from him, and he both liueth & raigneth for euer, ouer the house of Iacob, though he be persecuted in his mẽbers by the whore of Babylon, and his name is great amonge the Gentilles, from the Sunne rising to the going downe thereof, notwithstanding that all nations haue dronke of the cuppe of her fornications. The prophecyes of Gods spirit doe not one of them ouerthrow the other, but the one sheweth how the other is to be vnderstanded. And whereas you say our Church hath bene vnder a bushell before these fiftie yeares, because no historie maketh mention of any congregation professing our faith in any townes or places of diuers cõtryes at once, I aunswer this is as true as all your doctrine beside. For all auncient histories that write of the state of the primitiue Church, make mention of the same faith which we professe. And although towarde the reuelation of Antichrist, the puritie of the faith beganne to be polluted, yet the substance thereof continued, vntill by Antichrist, that great defection & apostasie was made, wherof the Apostle prophecyeth 2. *Thess.* 2. 3. And yet euen in the tyme of that apostasie, many histories make mention, of the continuance of our faith and Church in diuers contryes in Europe, namely England, Fraunce, Italy, or although vnder cruell persecution and tyranny, beside great nations of the East, which neuer submitted them selues to the Church of Rome, and yet retayned the substance of Christian faith and profession, though not without particular errors and superstition. Wherefore although they that were blind, or farre of from the Church of Christ, could not see her glory, although she had bene set vpon neuer so high an hill, no more then a citie built vpon the Alpes, can be seene in England, yet they that had spirituall eyes, and by Gods grace drewe neare vnto his Church, did in the most obscure

tymes,(as the worlde esteemeth them,) see the cleare bewtie of her light, and the glorye of the Lordes hill, lifted vp aboue all the hills in the world. *Esa.* 2.

The heathen tyrants, thought by their cruell persecution, that they had vtterly rooted out the name and nation of Christians from the face of the earth. Nero gloried that he had purged the world of the superstition of Christ, as appeareth in an olde inscription, in a picture of stone. *Neroni Cl. Cæs. Aug. Pontif. Max. ob pronin. latronib. & his qui nouam generi hum. superstitionem inculcar. purgatam.* To Nero Claudius Cæsar Augustus the greatest Prelate, for that he hath purged the prouince of theeues, and them that brought in a newe superstition to mankind. Likewise another like piller there is of Diocletian and Maximian, in these wordes. *Diocletian. Iouius Maximi. Herculeus Cæs. Augu. Amplificato per Orientem & Occident. nup. Rom. & nomine Christianorum deleto qui remp. euertebant.* Diocletianus Iouius and Maximianus Herculeus Cæsaris Augusti, hauing amplified the Empire of Rome, both in the East and West, and vtterly destroyed the name of Christians, which did ouerthrow the common wealth, Another like there is of Diocletian alone. *Diocletian. Cæs. Aug. Galerio in Oriente adoptat. superstitione Christi vbiq; deleta & cultu Deorum propagato.* Diocletianus Cæsar Augustus, hauing adopted Galerius in the East, and in all places vtterly destroyed the superstition of Christ, and set forth the worship of the Gods. By these inscriptions and glorious titles you see, that the heathenish tyrants, perswaded them selues, that they had vtterly defaced the religion of Christ, & destroyed his Church out of the worlde. what maruell then, if Antichrist and his adherents, which to the cruelty of the former tyrants haue added most detestable hypocrisy, haue thought that they had so wholy subuerted the true religion of Christ and his true Church, that the name ether of Church or religion, might not seeme to haue remayned in the world, but that of the Romish Antichrist. But as Nero the Pontif. Maximus of Rome,

which

with Diocletiane and the reste were deceyued in their time, so their succeſſors in place, office, and wickednes, the Popes of Rome are likewiſe diſapoynted of their cruell purpoſe.

But M. Sander glorieth that in all markes and ſignes of the true Church, the popiſh Church doth excel ours. But firſt of all, that which is the onely true marke and triall of the Church, namely the word of God, he denyeth to be a ſufficient marke of the true Church, yet had he before confeſſed the Church to be the piller and ſtay of truth. 1. *Tim.* 3. but the rule of truth (if we beleue our Sauiour Chriſt) is the word of God *Iohn.* 17. 17. therefore the word of God is the onely true tryall and marke of the Church.

But let vs conſider his reaſons, by which he woulde perſwade vs that ỹ word of God is not the chiefe marke whereby the true Church of God may be knowen. Firſt he ſayth the marke whereby an other thing is knowne, ought it ſelfe to be moſt exactly knowne, wheras we are not agreed what Gods word is. Note this reaſon of his, by which he taketh away all authoritie and vſe from the worde of God, not onely thereby to diſcerne the true Church, but alſo to teache vs any other thinge that is needefull for vs to know. But why I pray you are we not agreed what is Gods word? Forſooth becauſe ſome cal onely the written letter and the meaning thereof Gods word, other thinke many thinges are Gods word which are not expreſſely written, but deliuered by tradition from the Apoſtles, and by the holy Ghoſt, which hath written his lawes in our hartes: of this later ſort be the Papiſts, but they are eaſily confuted. For this principle muſt needes ſtand vnmoueable, that Gods ſpirite is neuer contrary to him ſelfe. Therefore ſeeing the ſpirite of God hath pronounced of the Scriptures, that they are able to make the man of God perfect prepared to all good workes. 1. *Tim.* 3. 16. it is certayne that God hath reuealed nothing by tradition, for our inſtructiõ, which is not conteyned in his worde written, much leſſe any

thing that is contrary to his doctrine deliuered in the holy Scriptures.

His second reason is, that we are not agreed vpon the written word of God, because the Protestants doe not admitte so many bookes of the olde testament as the Catholikes doe. I aunswer, the Protestants doe admit as many as the Catholike Church euer did or doth at this day. His third reasō is, that the meaning of those bookes which we are agreed vpon, is altogether in question betwene vs, therfore that can be no marke of the church, which it self is not knowne. I answer, although heretikes which are ouerthrowen in their owne conscience, will acknowledge no meaning to be true but their owne, yet are there many principles in the Scriptures so playne, as they are graunted by both partes, or els can not without shame be denyed of our aduersaries, out of which playne certeyne and immutable principles, all matters in controuersie may be proued and the same church also discerned, which is the verie cause, why the Papistes dare not abide the triall by the Scriptues, but flye to traditions, euen as their forefathers the auncient Valentinian heretikes, of whome Irenæus writeth *lib. 3. cap. 2.*

" *Cum ex Scripturis arguuntur, in accusationem conuertuntur*
" *ipsarū Scripturam, quasi non rectè habeant, neque sint ex au-*
" *ctoritate, quia variè sunt dictæ, & quia non possit ab his in-*
" *ueniri veritas, qui nesciant traditionem, non enim per literas*
" *traditam sed per viuam vocem.* When they are conuinced
" out of the Scriptures, then fall they to accusing of the
" Scriptures them selues as though they were not
" right: nor of sufficient authoritie, because they are
" spoken doubtfully, and that the trueth cannot be found
" of them which knowe not the tradition, for that was not
" deliuered by letters, but by word of mouth. Thus much Ireneus of the olde Heretikes, and what his iudgement
" was of the meaning of the Scripture which M. Sand.
" maketh so ambiguous, he declareth lib. 2. cap. 35. *Vniuer-*
" *sæ scripturæ & Propheticæ & Euangelicæ in aperto, & sine*
ambiguitate, & similiter ab omnibus audiri possunt &c. The whole

whole Scriptures both of the Prophets, and of the Goſpells, are open and without ambiguitie, & may be heard of all mé alike. This ſpeaketh Irenæus not of euery text of Scripture, but of the whole doctrine of the Prophets and Apoſtles, which is ſo playne and eaſie to be founde in the Scriptures, that no man can miſſe thereof, that ſeeketh not of purpoſe to be deceyued, as he ſayth cap. 67. of the ſame booke.

But M. Sander is content for diſputation ſake to admit Gods word for a marke of the true Church, and will proue that it is firſt with the Papiſtes. 1.

For if by Gods word we meane the written letter of the Bible, they are before vs, becauſe we haue none aſſured copies thereof, which we receyued not of them, for ſince that day in which S. Peter and S. Paule deliuered Gods word to the Romaines, the Church of Rome hath alwayes kept it without leeſing or corrupting.

I aunſwer we meane not by Gods worde the written letter onely, but receyuing and obeying the true and playne ſenſe thereof to be the marke of the Church. Againe I deny, that we had any aſſured copies of the olde and new teſtament of the popiſh Church, but the one of the Iewes in Hebrue, the other of the Greeke Church in Greeke. And whereas he talketh of a certayne daye in which S. Peter and S. Paule deliuered the Scripture to the Romains, it ſauoreth altogether of a popiſh fable, finally how the Romiſh Church in theſe laſt dayes hath kept the Scripture from corruption, although I coulde ſhew by an hundreth examples, yet this one ſhall ſuffice for all, the very firſt promiſe of the Goſpell, that is in the Scripture. *Gen.* 3. that the ſeede of the woman ſhoulde breake the ſerpents heade, the popiſh Church hath ether willfully corrupted, or negligently ſuffered to be depraued, thus, *ipſa conteret caput tuum*, ſhe ſhall breake thyne heade, referring that to the woman which God ſpeaketh expreſſely to the ſeede of the woman.

The ſecond marke is, that the Papiſtes acknowledge more of the Bible then we doe, by the bookes of Toby, 2.

Iudeth, Wiſedom, Eccleſiaſticus and of the Machabees. I aunſwer in that you adde vnto the word of God, it is a certayne argument, that you are not the true Church of Chriſt, for the true Church of Chriſt hath euer accompted thoſe bookes for apocryphall, witneſſe hereof « *Hieronym præf. in prouerb. Sicut ergo Iudith & Tobiæ &* « *Machabæorum libros legit quidem Eccleſia, ſed eos inter Ca-* « *nonicas Scripturas non recipit: ſic & hæc duo volumina le-* « *gat ad ædificationem plebis, non ad auctoritatē Eccleſiaſticorū* « *dogmatum confirmandam.* Therefore as the Church doth « in deede reade the bookes of Iudith, Tobias, and of the « Machabees, but ſhe receyueth them not among the ca- « nonicall Scriptures: ſo ſhe may reade theſe two bookes « (meaning the booke of Wiſedom and Eccleſiaſticus) « for the edifying of the people, but not to confirme the « authoritie of Eccleſiaſticall opinions. Nether is Auguſtine *de doct. Chriſt. lib. 2. cap. 8.* (whō M. Sander quoteth) of any other iudgement, but preſcribeth rules how the canonicall Scriptures are to be knowne. And *cont. Gaudent. epiſt. lib. 2. cap. 23.* he confeſſeth plainely that the booke of Machabees is not accompted of the Iewes as the law, the Prophets and the Pſalmes, which our Sauiour Chriſt admitteth as his witneſſes: yet it is receyued of the Church, if it be read or heard ſoberly. Whereby it is manifeſt, that the Church in his tyme receyued it not abſolutely, as part of the Canonicall Scripture, but vnder condition of a ſober reader or hearer. As for the decree aſcribed to Gelaſius, it hath no ſufficient credit of antiquitie, and much leſſe the late councels of Florence and Trent, which he quoteth. Beſide that the ſame decree of Gelaſius admitting but one booke of Eſdras, excludeth the Canonicall booke of Nehemias, and receyueth but one booke of the Machabees which will doe the Papiſtes but ſmall pleaſure.

3. The third marke, the popiſh Church receyueth not only the hebrue text of the old teſtament, & the greeke of the new, but alſo the greeke tranſlation of the ſeptuaginta, and the common Latine tranſlation, to be of full autho-

authoritie, whereas we giue ſmall credit to thoſe tranſlations, except they agree with the firſt Hebrue and Greeke copies. Therefore the Papiſts haue Gods word in more authenticke tongues and copies then we haue. I aunſwer, The Tridentine councell alloweth none for authenticall, but the common Latine tranſlation, that is the worſt of all: but in that the popiſh Church admitteth differing tranſlations from the originall truth of the Hebrue and Greeke text, to be of full authoritie with the truth, it appeareth plainely that ſhe is not the Church of Chriſt: which ether willfully confoundeth error with truth, or els lacketh the ſpirite of diſcretion to know the one from the other. And for more authentike copies it is impudently ſayd, that the Papiſtes doe receiue, for we receiue not onely all theſe which he nameth, but alſo the moſt aunciēt Chaldee Paraphraſtes, & the Syrian text of the new teſtament, yea the Arabicall text of the whole Bible, beſide, all vulgare tranſlations of Engliſh, French, Dutch, Italian, Spaniſh, which the Papiſtes can not abide. All thoſe, I ſaye, we receyue as authenticall copies for Chriſtian men to vſe: but ſo that the tryall of all tranſlations be made, by the originall truthe of the Hebrue and Greeke texts: in which tongue, the olde and newe Teſtament were firſt written.

Fourthly, the Papiſtes doe tranſlate and expounde Gods worde in all maner of tongues, better then we, becauſe they haue not onely internall vocation, but alſo externall vocation and commiſſion from the Apoſtles, by lyneall ſucceſſion of Biſhops and Preeſtes: whereas we haue no commiſſion, but from the common wealth which hath none authoritie to make Preeſtes &c: and yet how ſhall they preache if they be not ſent? *Rom.10.* I aunſwer concerning tranſlations of the word of God into all tongues I neuer ſaw any, nether is there any tranſlation to be ſhewed of any Papiſt, into any vulgare tongue. 4.

And as for the externall calling of the Papiſtes, I ſay

it is not from any lawfull ſucceſſion of the Apoſtles and auncient Church, whoſe faith and doctrine they do not follow in their interpretations, for if lyneall ſucceſſion of Prieſtes and Biſhops coulde make interpretations good, the doctrine of Arius, Neſtorius, Macedonius, and many other heretikes, whoſe externall calling was according to the lyneall and ordinary ſucceſſion of Biſhops and Prieſtes, might be auctoriſed for Catholike. Yea the Papiſtes might not refuſe whatſoeuer Luther, Bucer, Cranmer, and other haue taught, which had the ſame lyneall ſucceſſion that M. Sander doth nowe bragge of. And as for our externall calling, he ſayth falſly it is of the common weale &c, whereas it is of the Church, and therefore ordinarye and lawfull, and the ſaying of S. Paule whom he citeth *Rom.* the tenth is of the inward calling and ſending by God, whereof our doctrine agreeable with the Scripture and our whole intent to ſet forth the glory of God is a ſufficient profe, the one to ſatisfie men, the other to aunſwer our owne conſcience.

5. Fiftly he ſayth it is no perfection at all on our ſide, that we reade Gods word to the people in our Church ſeruice in the vulgare tongue, for thereby we lacke the vſe of the better tongues, as of the Greeke and Latine. O maiſter of impudencie, what vſe is there of the Greeke and Latine tongues, to be read to the people that vnderſtande them not? And why are thoſe the better tongues? he ſayth they were ſanctified on Chriſtes croſſe for all holy vſes, and eſpecially to ſerue God in the tyme of ſacrifice. But howe were they ſanctified I pray you? For ſooth, becauſe Pilate wrote the title in Hebrue, Greeke, and Latine, that it might be vnderſtoode of all nations for what cryme he was condemned. And is Pilate nowe become a ſanctifier of tongues for Gods ſeruice? is the malicious ſcorne of an heathen tyrant, a ſanctification of theſe tongues? O braſen foreheads of ſhameles Papiſtes. But heare more yet of this impudent ſtuffe.

This

This ſanctification was the cauſe, that the Apoſtles in the Eaſt and Weſt deliuered theſe tongues alone as holy, learned and honorable, not regarding the infinite multitude of prophane and barbarous tongues, whereof it came, that the Eaſt Church was called the Greeke Church, & the Weſt the Latine Church. But the Scripture, *Acts* the ſecond, doth teach vs, that the holy Ghoſt hath ſanctified all tongues of all nations to the prayſing of God, and that the Apoſtles deliuered the magnifical prayſes of God, in all languages. *Act.* 2. 11. And although the Greeke and Latine tongues, were moſt vſed, & moſt commonly vnderſtoode in the Romane Empire, yet the Church of Chriſt was enlarged farther then euer the Romane Empire extended in Perſia, Armenia, AEthiopia, India &c. where there was no knowledge, ether of the Greke or Latine tongues. And euen in the Romain Empire thoſe nations, to whome the Latine & Greeke tongues were not vulgare, vſed their Church ſeruice in other tongues. *Hieronym. in epitaphio Paulæ ad Euſtochium* telleth, that at the ſolemne funeralls of Paule: euery nation that was preſent, did ſinge their Pſalmes in order in their owne language. *Hebræo, Græco, Latino, Syróque ſermone Pſalmi in ordine perſonabant.* In the Hebrue, Greeke, Latine and Syrian ſpeache, the Pſalmes were ſonge in order. But ſeeing Maiſter Sander alloweth none other ſanctification of the tongues, but Pilates title on the croſſe, how is the Hebrue tongue which was one of the three, and the moſt principall, as the firſt tongue of the worlde, and for the excellencye therof called the holy tongue, how is that I ſay, ſhut out from Church ſeruice, why was there not an Hebrue ſeruice eſtabliſhed by the Apoſtles as well as the Greeke and Latine? But yet he bringeth another argument to proue that it is lawfull to reade ſeruice to the people in a tongue ẅ they vnderſtād not, by the exāple of Chriſt, who in time of his ſacrifice, did recite the beginning of the 21 Pſalme, *My God, my God, why haſt thou forſaken me,* in ẏ Hebrue tongue, which he knew the people did not

vnderstand, and did not interprete the same in the vulgar tounge. Good Lord into what foolishnes doth satan carry their minds, that wilfully striue against the truth? For what reason is this? Christ in his priuate praier, that concerned his owne person, spake with a toũg that was not commonly vnderstood, therefore the ordinary publike seruice ought to be in a straũge toung. Christ compassed about with his enemyes, & none within the hearing of him but the virgine Mary, & Iohn the Euangelist w loued him or regarded him spake Hebrue, therefore the Priestе in the church, must speake Latine or Greeke. But when M. Sand. hath played with this argument as long as he can, his antecedent is vtterly false, for Christe resited not that texte of the Psalme in the Hebrue, but in the Syrian toung, which was the vulgar tounge vnderstood and spoken of all the people, as is manifestly proued by the word *Sabacl zani* reported by both the Euangelists. Mat. 27. Mark. 15. Which is of the Syrian tounge, whereas the Hebrue texte is *Hazabtani*, as I report me to all that can but read two tounges Hebrue and Syrian. And whereas the malicious Helhoũds said he called for Elias, it was not becausе they vnderstood him not, but becausе they most dispightfully mocked his most vehement praier, taking occasion of the like sound of the name of God & of Elias, as scornefull deriders vse to doe.

Sixtly, lest the Protestants should passe the Papistes in any one iote, they haue the vse of the vulgar tongues in Dalmatia, Assyria, & Æthiopia, which acknowledge the supremacie of the Byshop of Rome. This is a loude lye, for neither the church of Dalmatians, Moscouites, Armenians, Assirians, Æthiopiãs, nor any other of those East nations, that retaine the name of Christe, did euer acknowledge the Popes supremacie. I knowe they haue fayned Fables of Letters sent from Preto Ioannes and such like, which are meere forgeryes vppon the submission of some one poore wanderer, that hath come out of those countryes. But M. Sand, will shewe the

cause

cause, why all Nations are not suffered likewise to vse their vulgar tounges in their seruice. First he sayeth vulgar tounges cause barbarousnesse, for the Preachers of those Countryes vnderstande not the Latine and Greeke tounges by this meanes. What an absurde reason this is, experience doth shewe. For when or where was greater ignorance in the Cleargie, then there, and at such time as the Latine seruice was vsed? How many in all England vnderstoode or coulde read the Greeke tonng within these sixtie or eightie yeeres? I speake nothing of the Hebrue tounge. Contrarywise what age was euer more full of lyberall knowledge in all Sciences, and learned tounges, then this is euen in England, France, & Germany, where seruice is vsed in the vulgar toũge? Therfore the vse of the vulgar toũge in Church Seruice is not the cause of barbarousnesse.

The seconde reason is, that neceffitie inforceth the Apostolike See to tollerate these Nations in their vulgar tounges, becausse they knowe none other, but Protestants by schisme are fallen from Latine to Englishe, that is from better to worse, and therefore not to be tollerated. But indeede the neceffitie is, becausse they will not receiue your Latine tounge, and our schisme is from Antichriste to be ioyned with Christe, from whose doctrine the Church of Rome by horrible schisme is departed, for what the doctrine of Christe is concerning Publique Prayers in a tounge that is not vnderstoode, his Apostle Saincte Paule hath abundauntly taught vs, the 1. Corinthes the 14. Chapter. Finally we defende that our naturall Englishe tounge, is better to edifie Englishe men, then your balde Latine toũge that you vse in your popish seruice is for any vse of any man learned or vnlearned.

Seuenthly the Papistes doe not onely consider the written letter, but also the plain meaning of euery proposition and as the words doe sound, so doe they vnderstand them. And heerof he bringeth many exãples. To this I answere, that if they vnderstande all propositions,

aſwel figuratiue as plain & proper ſpeaches as the words doe ſound, they make monſtrous interpretations, as if they vnderſtande this propoſition the rock was Chriſte as the words ſound, they make a new tranſubſtantiation of the ſtone into Chriſt, or this: This cuppe is the newe Teſtament, if their interpretation be none other then the ſound of the word doth giue, they make the newe Teſtament to be nothing but a drinking veſſel. But to diſcuſſe his examples, the firſt is this text. Matth. 26.

1 *This is my body, why ſaith he is this which Chriſte poynteth to, denied to be his body.* I anſwere, it is affirmed to be his body in that ſence that he ſpake and otherwiſe then he ment, it is denyed to be his body.

2 *Againe Iames ſaith Cap. 2. A man is iuſtified of workes & not of faith onely. VVhy then are workes denyde to iuſtifie, or onely faith taught to iuſtifie.* I aunſwere woorkes are not denyed to iuſtifie before men, and onely faith is taught to iuſtifie before God. Rom. 3.

3 *The doers of the lawe ſhalbe iuſtified. Rom. 2. VVhy then teach you the lawe not to be able to be doone.* Becauſe the Apoſtle ſaith, that of the workes of the law none ſhalbe iuſtified before God. Rom. 3. 20. for if the woſkes of the lawe could be done, by any man perfectly as the law requireth, he ſhold be iuſtified by thé as the text affirmeth

4 *By the obedience of one, that is Chriſte, many ſhall bee made righteous. Rom. 5. VVhy then are wee denyed to bee really righteous, and ſayde to bee righteous by imputation onely?* Becauſe the obedience of Chriſte is not really our obedience, but by imputatiō of God through faith.

5 *The loue of God is ſpread in our heartes by the holy ghoſt, which is geuen vs. Rom. 5. This is more then a bare imputing of righteouſneſſe to vs*, yea Sir, but this is not our iuſtification, but an effect thereof, for he ſaide immediatly before that beeing iuſtified by faith wee haue peace with God.

6 *VVhoſe ſinnes ye forgiue they ſhalbe forgiuē them. Ioh. 20 VVhy then are Biſhops and Prieſts denyed to forgiue ſinnes.* We graunt that true Byſhops and elders haue authoritie to

tie to forgiue sinnes in Gods name, but not absolutely.

He that is great among you, let him be made as the yonger. Luke 22. VVhy then deny you that one was greater among the Apostles, and is stil among the Byshops their successors. One was not greater among the Apostles in authoritie, for their greatnes was to be the greatest seruaunt & to take the most paines, & to be most humble. Mat. 18 7

Thou art Peter or a rock, and vpon this Rock I wil builde my Church Mat. 16, VVhy is the militant Church denyed to be built vpon S. Peter and his successors in that chayre and office? The Church is affirmed to be built vpon the foundation of the Prophets and Apostles, and so vpon Peter as one of thē, in which office he hath no successors. 8

Keepe the traditions which yee haue learned, either by word or by an Epistle. 1. Thessa. 2. VVhy then are traditions so dispised that the name cannot be suffred in the English Bible. It may and is suffred in that sense, which the holye Ghost vseth it, but not to bring in prayer for the deade or any thing contrary to the scripture, vnder the name of traditions Apostolike. For the Apostle speaketh only of the doctrine which he deliuered to them, either by preaching or by Epistle, which is none other, then is cōtayned in the holy Seriptures. For of other traditions pretended to be of the Apostles, he biddeth them take heede in the same Chapter. vers. 2. 9

He that ioyneth his Virgine in mariage doth well and hee that doth not ioyne her doth better. VVhy make you mariage as good as virginitie? For such as haue the gift of continence we graunt virginitie is better in such respectes as the Apostle teacheth, 10

Vowe ye and render your vowes vnto God. Psal. 75. If thou wilt be perfect go and sel all thinges which thou haste & gine them to the poore & follow me. Mat. 19. There are Eunuches which haue gelded them selues for the kingdome of Heauen. Obey your Rulers, and be subiect vnto them? VVhy thē are the vowes of powertie, of chastitie and obedience, counted vnlawful, or men cōstrained not to performe thē. The first text perteineth to the old Testamēt, The second is a singular 11

tryall.to that one place.The third we graunt in them to whome it is giuen,the fourth we neuer made queſtion about it,but al theſe are euil fauouredly patched togither,to proue the vowe of Monkery lawfull, which is ſuperſtitious for want of Gods commaundement, blaſphemous for the opinion of merite, impoſſible for the frailtie of many mens nature. As for compulſion there is none vſed, for no man is compelled to be rich, vnchaſte or diſobedient.

12 *Doe ye the worthy fruites of penaunce, Luc.3. VVhy thē is ſatisfaction and penaunce deſpiſed with you?* This text is, Doe ye the fruits worthy of repentance.We honour the fruites worthy of true repentance,and exhorte all men to bring them forth,but popiſh ſatiſfaction hath nothing like to them.For we beleeue that God doth freely forgiue the penitent for Chriſtes ſake.

13. *The huſband & wife beeing two in one fleſh, is a greate ſacrament or miſtery in Chriſt, & in the church.Ephe.5.VVhy is then the mariage of faithful perſons denied to be a ſacrament.* If you vnderſtand a ſacrament generally,for euery myſtery, we may graunt you it is a ſacrament,but if you vnderſtand a ſacrament ſpecially for an outwarde ſigne of Gods fauour & grace or a ſeale of our iuſtification it isnone.For if it were it ſhould be neceſſary for all men to receiue it,againe it hath the inſtitutiō of God before the fall of man,therefore can be no ſacrament of ŷ new Teſtament to teſtifie our reſtitution.Your cōmon tranſlation turneth the Greeke word μυστηριον which is a holy ſecret,oftentime *Sacramentum*,yet I know you woulde be aſhamed to confeſſe ſo many ſacramentes of the popiſh church,as there be miſteries which hee calleth ſacraméts as Ephe.3.the preaching of the goſpell to the Gentiles he calleth *Sacramentum*.1. Tim.3.So he calleth the incarnation of Chriſt *ſacramentum pietatis*. And are you not aſhamed to delude ignorant men, with the ambiguous name of a Sacrament.

14. *VVork your ſaluatiō with feare & trembling Phi.2.VVhy then are you ſo preſumptuous, as euen by faith to aſſure your ſelues*

selues of your saluation? because it followeth immediatly that it is God which worketh in vs both to will and to performe according to his good wil, for it is no presumtion to assure our selues that the promises of God are true. And he may wel feare, which is assured to be saued, for faith doth not exclude but plant in vs the feare of God, though not a seruile feare. As for ỹ deepe secretes of Gods predestination, we take not vpon vs to knowe them, otherwise then they be reuealed by his worde. Finally, where you aske whether faith be not an ordinary gift in the Church, I answere you ẅ the Apostle, that all men which are in the outward face of the Church, and participate the Sacraments, haue not fayth. 2. *Thess.* 3. 2.

The 8. marke of the Church if not onely the playne vnderstanding of any one sentence, but also the circumstance of the place, and the conference of Gods worde be necessary, the Papists haue vsed it in euery question. For proofe herof M. Sanders referreth vs to his treatise of the supper of the Lord *lib.* 4. and to his booke of Images *cap.* 2. & 11. & in this booke to the *ca.* 2. & 4. I answer you make a light shew, for a fashion, but you nether cõsider the circumstances rightly, nor make any true collation of one place with another, as is proued by the answers of these bookes: Therefore your Academical conclusion is false, hereticall & blasphemous, that the onely word of God, being neuer so well handled, is no sufficient marke to shew the truth. When Christ sayth, Sanctifie them in thy truth, Thy word is the truth. *Ioan.* 17. 17. 8.

The 9. M. Sander sayth: the heads of the Church, the councels, the Bishops and the auncient fathers must be Iudges whether we do well apply the Scriptures or no? as whether S. Peter be the rock which M. Iewel denieth, & he proueth by 16 doctors afterward *cap.* 4. of ẅ proofe we shall consider God willing in due place. But whereas M. Sander quoteth *Aug. cont. Iulian. lib.* 2. for his rule of Iudges: I say, he hath no such rule in that booke, onely Augustine doth cõuince the argumẽts of the Pelagians of nouelry, by the iudgemẽt of *Iren. Cyprianus, Rheticus,* 9.

Ambrosius &c and other, which liued before their time, and therefore were no partial iudges, so do we conuince the Popish heresies, and their argumentes of noueltie, not only by the manifest worde of God, but also by the testimonie of the most auncient fathers, although we may not admit all that they did write to be true, euen as the same Augustine being pressed with the auctoritie of Ambrose, Chrysostome, and Cyprian by the Donatists & Pelagians, prouoketh from them onely to the Scriptures. *de nat. & gra. cap. 61. de vnit. eccl. cap. 16. cont. Cresc. lib. 2. cap. 31. de gratia Christ. cap. 43.* That the allegation of the fathers suffiseth not of it selfe, we agree with Maister Sander, but that there is any other triall of the truth thé Scripture, we wil neuer graunt, seeing God hath therein deliuered his whole doctrine, whatsoeuer is necessarie for vs to beleue that we may be saued. *Ioh. 20. 31.*

10. *But the Papistes for the tenth marke ioyne tradition and practise of Gods church, which can neuer deceaue a mā. We thinke* (sayth Chrysostom) *the tradition of the church to be worthie of beleefe. Is it a tradition? aske no further.* But howe shall we proue it to be a tradition of the church. The Valentinians (as I shewed before out of Irenæus) denyed the Scriptures to be sufficient, without knowledge of the tradition. Therfore to discerne the tradition of ỹ church from the tradition of the heretikes, we haue none other triall but by the Scriptures. Therefore Chrysostom saith in 2. *Cor. Ho. 3.* that S. Paule did write the same thinges which he told them before in preaching. As for the vniuersall practise either of the Popes supremacy, or of the sacrifice of the masse which he braggeth of, shall neuer be proued, but the contrarie.

11. The eleuenth marke is the auctority of generall councells confirming the truth, & condemning heretikes, & such he maketh the late councell of Trent to be. But we deny that *Concilia bulum*, of a few Popish hypocrits, to be a generall councell, in which no man should haue a definitiue voyce, but they that were accused of heresie and whereof, he that is most of all charged with heresie, that

is

is the Pope, is made the supreme iudge, wherefore the Papists haue no lawfull generall councell on their side, although generall councells as he confesseth, are no sufficient triall of the true church, both because they may be hindered many wayes, and also because they may erre, as did the conncells of Arimine, and Ephesus.

In respect of these considerations, he maketh the twelfth marke to be the supremacy of the Pope, which is wholly theirs for triall whereof, this booke following was written. But for proofe that Christ hath appoynted such a iudge, ouer all, he citeth *Ioan.* 21. that Christ cõmaunded Peter to feede his sheepe, as though that perteyned not to euerie one of the Apostles, as much as to Peter. Also *Lu.* 22. that Christ hauing praied that Peters faith might not fayle, commaunded him when he was conuerted from his fall, to confirme his brethren, which perteineth only to the person of Peter, and can not with any cable ropes be drawẽ to the Bishop of Rome, or any successor of Peter, for it concerneth his singular, full, comfort & duty, in respect of his fall & Gods mercy, except that according to analogy, it may be applied to any man, that is so raised after his fall, and so that precept *confirme thy brethren*, geueth no speciall commaundemẽt to the Pope, but to euery man whom God hath mercifully conuerted as he did Peter. 12.

With the twelfth marke M. Sander would haue ended, but that the Protestantes, affirme the lawfull preaching of Gods word, and the lawfull administration of the Sacramentes to be a marke whereby they wil be tried. But seeing lawfull preaching & ministring must be tried by Gods worde, M. Sander first asketh what we call Gods word? & secondly he asketh if he haue not proued it to be more with thẽ thẽ with vs, whatsoeuer it be? It is like this Popishe academicall Atheist, hath proued Gods word to be on his side, ẏ wil not haue it certeinly known what Gods word is. After this he will proue the Papists to be most lawfull preachers, because they are likest to the Apostles, in conuerting many nations, within these 13.

900. yeres, whē he ſayth no man aliue could once heare vs peepe. As though controuerſie of nations would argue a true church. By which reaſons not only the Proteſtants may nowe proue them ſelues to be moſt like the Apoſtles in conuerting ſo many nations of Europe, but alſo the Arians, and moſt of all, the Mahumetiſts, might proue them ſelues the true church. It is not therfore cōuerſion of nations, but conuerſion of thē to the true doctrine of the Apoſtles, which maketh vs like the Apoſtles: & the Papiſtes, Arians, & Mahometiſts moſt vnlike vnto them. And where he ſaith, that no ſoūd of ours was heard in 900. yeares ſpace by any man aliue: to ſee how impudētly he lyeth, read *Flaccius Illyricus in catalogo teſtium veritatis*, & you ſhal ſee in all ages, what monumēts are extant of ſome few, whom God reſerued from that generall Apoſtaſie of Antichriſt. Read alſo the acts & monumentes ſet forth by M. Foxe, & you ſhall ſee the ſame moſt plentifully. He wil proue their adminiſtration of the Sacraments to be more lawful then ours, becauſe they haue fiue more then we. But I anſwer becauſe they haue fiue more then the worde of God alloweth, or the primitiue church acknowledgeth: & in the adminiſtration of the other they haue either altogether peruerted the inſtitution, as in the Lordes ſupper: or ſhamefully corrupted it with ſuperſtition, as in baptiſme: they are not the church of Chriſt, but the church of Antichriſt.

13 When we alledge the perſecution of the Romiſh Antichriſt, to be the cauſe that our church, hath not floriſhed in outward peace, & to be a marke alſo of the truth of our congregation, what maiſters (ſayth D. Sanders) Antichriſts perſecution ſhall dure but three yeres, & an halfe, and is the Pope Antichriſt, who hath dured theſe 900. yeres? But good M. Doctor determiner, how proue you that Antichriſts perſecution ſhall dure but three & an halfe, of ſuch yeares as the Pope hath dured 900. you quote *Dan. 7. Apoc. 13.* you might by as good reaſon ſay it ſhal dure but three dayes & an halfe *Apoc. 11. 9.* will you take vpon you ſo preciſely to determine of the myſticall number

nũber which is ſomtime called 3. yeares & an halfe, ſomtime 42. moneths, ſomtime 1260. daies, ſomtime 3. daies & an halfe, ſomtime a time & times & halfe a time, al which make halfe a Prophetical weeke, & ſignifie a time determined of God, but not plainly reuealed to many.

Secõdly you aſke, how it could be the true church, againſt ẅ Antichriſt ſo lõg preuailed, that no man could tel whether any ſuch were in ỹ earth: whẽ hel gates ſhal not preuaile againſt ỹ true church? I anſwere, if you can not put a difference betwene impugning & preuailing: you wil haue much to do to defend your Romiſh church to be the true church, againſt the Turkes thẽ ſelues, who haue poſſeſſed a great part of ỹ groũd, ẅ you ſay perteined once to your church. But herin appeareth the mark of the true church, againſt ẅ the gates of hell haue not preuailed, that although Satã was let looſe, the whore of Babylon dronken with the blood of her mẽbers, her two witneſſes ſlaine, ſhe her ſelfe driuen into the wildernes, her ſeede perſecuted whereſoeuer they were diſperſed, yet ſhe is reſtored in the ſight of the world, her witneſſes raiſed frõ death to life, the deuill is vanquiſhed, ỹ purple whore of Babylon is fallen, & Antechriſt ſhall at length be throwne into the lake with the deuil and his Angels. This is the Lordes worke & it is maruelous in our eyes.

If either perſecution, or not failing in perſecutiõ, be a 15.
marke of the church, it is more in the Papiſts thẽ in the Proteſtãts, for perſecutiõ he will proue that they be perſecuted by vs, as the mother by ỹ child, which departeth from her obedience, as Agar & Iſmael frõ Sara. But I anſwer, we are departed frõ Agar, vnder whom we were in bondage to Sara by whom we are made children of the heauẽly Ieruſalem: & euen as Agar departed frõ Sara, ſo did the ſynagoge of Rome frõ the Catholike church of Chriſt. For not failing in perſecutiõ, experiẽce teacheth in all countries, ẅ haue receaued the Goſpell, how ſmall puniſhmẽt ỹ greateſt nũber of Papiſts wil abide, for their Popiſh profeſſion: whereas ſo many thouſands of Gods Saincts being moſt cruelly murdred by ỹ popiſh church,

the church of Christ is not diminished but encreased thereby, euen as Cyprian saith the blood of the martyrs is the seede of church.

If antiquitie be a marke, it is proued to be on the Papists side by this reason. *The church is all one, the later part of the church for 900. yeares last past is on the Papistes side therefore the former parte also.* But this reason standing vpon a shamefull begging of that which is questioned, is soone turned vpon your owne necke. The church is in all but one, but the beginning of the church maketh not for you, therefore that which you say is the later part of the church, being contrary to that former, is no part of the church, so that by this reason, you shal neither haue antiquitie or any parte of the church.

But if you appeale to particular examples (sayth M.
2. Sander) I say the Christians in the primitiue church, did communicate vnder one kinde at Emaus, and at Ierusalem. And I say M. Sander, if he would burst him self with study, shall neuer proue it. He quoteth *Aug. de consen. Euang. lib. 3. cap. 25.* whose opinion was that Christ gaue
3. the sacramét at Emaus, but of communion in one kind, he neuer once dreamed.

He sayth the Christians did set vp images in the honor of Christ, quoting *Euse. lib. 7. cap. 14.* whereas Eusebius speaketh of heathen men, that of heathenish custome did set vp images and not of Christians.

4. Dionysius although he be auncient, yet he wrote not in the tyme of Eusebius, Hieronymus or Gennadius, & so was knowne for no writer in ỹ Church for 500. yeares after Christ, Wherefore I wil not stand about his errors and ceremonyes, which yet for the moste parte are as vnlike the popish ceremonyes, as they are to ours.

Although wee haue no certaintie of the writinges of Ignatius which are extant, yet is there nothing in them that fauoreth the Papists religion. Hee nameth a a sacrifice which could not be offered without the Byshop, that cannot be the Masse, whiche euery hedge-prieste may say, *ad Symrn. He would haue the Emperor obey*

the

the Bysshop (sayth M.Sand.) *ad Phil.* But this proueth the Epistle to bee counterfaite, for there was no Christian Emperour when Ignatius liued. (Although in deuine matters the Christian Emperour ought to obey the Bishop, or rather Gods word which ỹ Bishop preachet h.) *Also he speaketh of Virgins that had consecrated themselues to God:* & who speaketh against them, which hauing the gifte of continency doe keepe virginity? In the same Epistle: He affirmeth both Peter and Paule to haue bene maried, and will not condemne the mariage of church ministers.

He commendeth the lent fast ad Antioch. Choose M.Sander, whether your decretals lye of Thelesphorus that inuented the lent fast, or that this is a counterfait Epistle of Ignatius. In the Epistle ad Phil. Where he commendeth the 40. daies fast, the Wednesday & the Friday fast he saith farther. *Quicunq; dominicum aut sabbathum non ieiunauerit præter vnum sabbathum pascæ ipse est Christi* » *interfector:* Whosoeuer shall not fast the Lordes day or » sabbat beside one sabbat of Easter he is a murtherer of » Christ. If this be true antiquity: why doth the church of » Rome omit fast on Sunday: if it be counterfait? why is not M. Sander ashamed to alleage it?

Iustinus witnesseth that water was mingled with the wine. 5.
Yea but it was to alay the strength of the wine, not that it was necessary for the Sacrament, though afterward it grew to a superstitious obseruation. *He saith further, the Deacons caried the consecrated mysteries to them that were absent which Caluine reputeth for an abuse.* If they caried the bread & the wine as the Sacrament, it was an abuse not to be warranted by Gods word. But seeing the Deacons office was to minister to the poore: I thinke rather they caried it as the almes of the church, to suche as were needy.

What Pius decreed we finde in no writer of credit. As 6.
for the Popes law it is no good euidéce, hauing a bushel of drosse & counterfait dregs to one graine of good and true antiquitie. In deede Eusebius testifieth, that Victor

Biſhop of Rome did excommunicate the Biſhops of Aſia, about the celebration of Eaſter, but he teſtifieth alſo, that Victor was ſharply rebuked by diuerſe other godly Biſhops, namely by Irenæus of Lyons and Polycrates of Epheſus for ſo doing. *Euſeb. lib. 5. cap. 25.*

Tertullian ſayth all doctrine is falſe & lying that agreeth not with ſome Apoſtolike church. And ſuch is the doctrine, that the church of Rome holdeth, which agreeth with no Apoſtolike church, no not with the ancient Apoſtolike church of Rome. But our doctrine agreeth with all the Apoſtolike churches that euer were, planted in the earth and continued in the doctrine of the Apoſtles.

7. Tertullian a Montaniſt, ſpeaketh in deede of oblatiõs for the deade, but they were none other, then ſuche as they offred for the birth daies, & that was thãkeſgeuing. He ſpeaketh of praier for the deade, which he receaued of Montanus the heretike. The ſtations he ſpeaketh of were no gaddings, but ſtandings. The viſitation of Ieruſalem is denyed to no man that will take the paynes to go thither, nether was it euer like to Popiſh pilgrimage, which is to runne a whoring after Idolls.

8. We confeſſe with S. Cyprian, that the breade in the Sacrament is chaunged, not in ſhape but in nature, to be the fleſh of Chriſt vnderſtanding nature for propertie, and the fleſh of Chriſt to be receaued ſpiritually.

In publike offences we woulde haue confeſſion to be made publikely, before the Elders of the church, as Cyprian would them that fell in perſecution, but of Popiſh auricular confeſſion, he neuer ſpake one word. We acknowledge the forgiuenes of ſinnes by the miniſters, to be ratified by God, not binding Gods iudgemẽt to it but it to Gods iudgement. We graũt that tẽporal puniſhmẽt for ſatisfaction of the church ought to be appointed vnto publike offenders, which may be releaſed vpon their harty repẽtance, & is no more like to Popiſh pardõs, thẽ the ſtewes & market of Rome is like the church of God.

9. The reſt which he huddleth vp together, I wil anſwer as briefly. S. Iames his chaire was eſteemed, but as a monument

nument of antiquity & no holynes put in it. *Euſeb.lib.7. cap.15.* The ſoléne dedicating of churches was no more like Popiſh hallowing of churches, then Chriſtian preaching & praying is like to coniuration. *Euſeb.lib.9 ca.10.* The ſtraight life of heremites was as like the Popiſh heremites that dwelt at euery good townes end, where the other dwelled in the wildernes, as the city & the deſolat wildernes are alike *Ruff.li.11.c.4.* Driuing of deuils by holy water, was no ordinary ceremony, but a miracle once wrought by the Biſhop of Apamea, who whé the temple of Iupiter could not be burned with fire, that was ſet vnto it, after he had prayed, cauſed water ſigned with the croſſe to be ſprinckled on the altar, which being done, the deuills being driuen away, the temple was ſet on fire & burned: *Theodor.lib.5.c.29.* The auctority of vnwritten traditions is ſo defended by Baſil, *de ſp. ſanct. 27.* that he affirmeth whatſoeuer is not of the holy Scriptures, is ſinne. *Mor.diff.80.*

Praier to Sainct s, as the dregges of that time, I leaue to be ſucked vp of the Papiſtes. Repentance but no Popiſh ſacrament of penance, is cómended by S. Ambroſe. The name of the maſſe is not in Ambroſe *Ep.33.* for *miſsã facere* ſignifieth to let go, or let paſſe, not to ſay maſſe, ỹ name of ſacrifice ſignifieth a ſacrifice of thãkeſgiuing.

The Canon of the Popiſh maſſe is not in Ambroſe, but the forme of celebration of the communion in his time *de Sacr.li.4.ca.5. & 6.* Chryſoſtom reciteth the text of S. Iames onely to proue that God forgiueth ſinnes at the praiers of the Elders, not ſpeaking of the ceremony of extreame vnction, vſed by the Papiſts *& de Sacer.li.3.*

Hyeronym ad Vilant. alloweth not the ſuperſtitious vſe of burning candells in the day time. That he will not allow Biſhops to beget children, it ſheweth his errors, cõdemned by the Nicene councell, by the perſwaſion of Paphnutius: *Socr.li.1.cap.11.* Hieronyme ſpeaketh not of a certeine number of prayers, to confirme the vſe of your beades, but of a certeine nũber of the verſes of the holy Scripture to be learned as a talke to the Lord. *ad Furian.*

That he which hath had two wiues coulde not be a Priest in Hieronymus time ý was a litle of that chaffe, w̄ afterward ouerwhelmed ý good corne in the church of Rome. Hierom affirmeth that he, as helper, vnto the writing of Damasus Bishop of the city of Rome, did answere the synodicall consultation that came from the East & the West. What is this to any purpose of the Papistes? Not only the Bishop of Rome was consulted, nor he alwaies, except the matter concerned the whole church, when no member should be lefte vnconsulted, and not made priuye.

Finally that Augustine sayeth, that the fier by which some shalbe saued after this life, is more greeuous then any paine of this life. *Psal.* 37, he sayth the contrary *de fide ad Laurent. cap* 68 where he denieth that text of scripture to be vnderstode of punishment after this life: and sayeth the whole matter of purgatory may be enquired of, as a matter vncertaine. The like *De octo Dulcitij quæst.* 91. *& cont. Pelag. Hypog. lib.* 5. he knoweth heauē & hell, and vtterlye denyeth the third place to be found in the scriptures. By which it appeareth, that this error of purgatory was but very young in Augustines time. And now you see what antiquity he can boast of, for when he hath wrested & wrong all that he can, scarce two or thre errors haue any shadow of antiquity, & those not in the greatest matters, wheras the whole substance of the doctrine of fayth in God, iustification by Christ, the true worship of God, the vertue of Christes death, the infirmity of man, the right vse of the sacramentes the auctority of the holy scriptures, & a nūber more of such principall heades of Christian learning, in which we differ from them, he is as silent as a stone.

17. The 17. marke, is the name of Catholikes, which M. Iewel confesseth to haue bene of late geuen to the Papistes, which among other thinges, stayed S. August. in the right fayth, as he confesseth *Cont. epist. Manich. lib.* 4. But seing the name of Catholikes was falsly geuen to you, which are nowe ryghtlye called by the name of your

your archeheretike the pope, papistes, the onely name of Catholikes, which was geuen to you by your selues, to shadowe your heresies, cannot proue you to be Christians, or your church to be Catholike, especially seeing you lacke the truth which Augustine in the same place, confesseth to be more worth then either succession, antiquity, the name of Catholike, or any other thing else.

The eyghteenth marke is the succession of Priestes, and Bishops, euen from the seate of Peter vnto Pius the fifth in whose time this booke of M. Sander was written, which marke is approued by Augustine, by Irenæus, by Tertullian, by Optatus & by Hieronym, as he sayth, being one of the most euident of all other, but therein he belyeth all these fathers whom he citeth, who neuer alleaged the bare succession of place & persons, but ioyned with the cõtinuance of doctrine, receaued from the Apostles, against new & late sprong vp heresies. Augustine shall speake for the rest, who after he hath alleaged vnto the Donatistes, the successions of Bishops from Peter in the vnity of the Catholike church, among which was neuer a Donatist, the iudgement of the Bishop of Rome in absoluing of Cecilianus, and many such like reasons, whereunto he thinketh the Donatistes shoulde yeelde, yet in the ende, he addeth these words. *Quamquàm nos non tam de istis documentis presumamus, quam de Scripturis sanctis.* Although we doe not so much presume of this documents as of the holy Scriptures.

These eighteene markes M. Sander will haue to be more richly seene in them, then in the Protestantes, but what markes they are, and how they are to be found in their church, I haue briefely shewed. But nowe he commeth to a general challenge to proue that we haue nothing which they lacke, and we lacke many thinges which they haue. *First they haue a iustifying faith as well as we, but not iustifying alone, but with charity, which is the life of faith.* But charitye is a fruict of a liuinge and vnfayned fayth, not the life thereof. 1. *Tim.* 1. 5. the effect not the cause, and we holde with Sayncte Paule

that a man is iuſtified by faith without the workes of the lawe. *Rom.* 3. for charitie is no inſtrument to apprehend the mercie of God, but faith onely, therefore faith onely doth iuſtifie. We are iuſtified *gratis*, freely by his grace. *Rom.* 3. 24. therfore nothing can come in accompt of iuſtification before God, but onely faith. which ſeeing ỹ Papiſtes haue not, they haue not a iuſtifying faith.

We haue two Sacraments, and they haue ſeuen, but ſeeing they haue fiue more then Chriſt inſtituted, and haue peruerted the one, and polluted the other, they haue but one Sacrament at the moſt, and that horribly prophaned, I meane baptiſme. *VVe haue an inward prieſthood* (he ſayth) *to offer vp Chriſt in our hartes, and they offer him both in hartes and handes.* But our ſpirituall prieſthood is not to offer vp Chriſt, but ſpirituall ſacrifices acceptable by Chriſt 1. *Pet.* 2. 5. *Heb.* 13. 15. and they are horrible blaſphemers, that take vpon them to offer vp Chriſt, whome none could offer but him ſelfe by his eternall ſpirite. *Heb.* 9. 14.

He ſayth, that the Papiſtes *beleeue as well as we, that Chriſt by one ſacrifice payed our rawnſom for euer, when they ſhewe it to the eye in the oblation of their Maſſe*, then the which nothing can be more contrary to the onely ſacrifice of Chriſt once offred and neuer to be repeated, becauſe he founde eternall redemption thereby. *Heb.* 10. 14. 9. 12. *&* 25. *&c.*

He addeth that they beleue Chriſt to be the head of the Church, *and ſhewe it by a reall figure of one heade, in earth, meaning the Pope*, whome now he maketh a figuratiue heade, as though Chriſt were not preſent with his Churche, or that his Churche were a monſter with two heades.

As laye men receyue the communion in both kindes with vs, ſo they do with them in Auſtria by the Popes diſpenſation, as though Chriſtes commaundement and inſtitution were not ſufficient without the Popes diſpenſation. Wherein alſo he affirmeth a monſtrous abſurditie, that the Sacrament was not inſtituted in two kindes,

kindes, to be so receyued, but by an vnbloody sacrifice, to shewe the nature of his bloody sacrifice in which his soule and blood was separated from his body and flesh, and yet he sayth the body and flesh of Christ, is not well conteyned in the cuppe, as his blood in the paten, with the body and forme of breade, and no separation of the one from the other, and no more contayned or distributed by both, then by one alone. Which saying is to be receyued with whoopes and hisses, of all men that haue their fiue witts.

They haue mariage (he sayth) in greater price then we, because they teach it to be a sacrament, but we find it not instituted by Christ to be a sacrament of the new testament, therfore we receyue it as an holy ordinance, contayning also a great mystery, but yet no sacrament. But if it be an holy sacrament, why doe you thinke it vnmeete for ministers of the Church? and why doth your Pope Syricius, or rather some counterfeating Canonist in his name, call holy matrimony a liuing in the flesh, such as can not please God. But although mariage be honorable in all men (you saye) it is not so in them that haue gelded them selues for the kingdome of heauen, who haue no more possibilitie to marye, then a gelded man to beget children. You were best then to tel the Apostle that his saying was too generall, for he shoulde haue excepted them that so gelded them selues. But S. Paule sayth, notwithstanding your impossibilitie, if a virgine doe marye, she doth not sinne. 1. *Cor.* 8.28. You will reply he speaketh of them that haue not vowed, & how proue you that Christ speaketh of them that haue vowed, longer then God would giue them grace to liue chast, which he affirmeth to be a peculiar gift, & not in the power of euery man. *Mat.* 19.12. But what if your popish geldings, by neying at euery mans wife, and by tombling in all beddes, where they are not kept out by force, proue them selues to be stone horses, are they still in the number of those, that hauing gelded them selues for the kingdom of heauen, may not possibly ma-

rye, and yet nether we will nor can possibly liue chast? But omitting these thinges, which they haue as well as we, now he commeth to those thinges, which we lacke, and yet many of them are very necessary: as insufflations, that is blowing vpon: exorcismes, that is coniuring: holy oyle in baptisme, chrisme in Bishopping, externall priesthood, sacrifice, altars, censing, lights, and so forth a large rablement of popish errors and superstitious ceremonies. And that we saye falsly, in saying these are naught, he proueth by S. Paules saying to the Galathians, *præterquam quod accepistis*, beside that you haue receyued. for once (sayth he) we haue receyued those thinges of our auncestors, as if S. Paule had not spoken of the Gospell, but of beggerly ceremonies, which because they are an other Gospell, and way of saluation, brought in by the Pope, then S. Paule deliuered to the Galathians: we hold the Pope & thē iustly accursed. *But we iustifie them* (sayth he) *by the word of God.* not written I am sure, but by your counterfeit word of traditions, & as you say by bookes of auncient fathers, and yet not by bookes of the most auncient fathers: in whome is litle or nothing at all of suche drosse and chaffe, amonge a great deale of good corne.

But seeing we made no new religion in those and such like thinges (sayth he) *but keepe the olde: humilitie, obedience, and vnitie is our fault, if we haue any.* O faultles hypocrites, if the older truth had neuer bene reuealed vnto you, against your olde heresies, your faults had bene the lesse. but nowe your darkenes being conuinced of the light, your pride, rebellion, and schisme from Christ and his Church, is and appeareth most haynous and manifest.

Now seeing M. Sander dare not encounter with vs in this very poynt of our contention, he fayneth an Idoll of an aduersary, to shew his manhood vpon, before his friendes, that they may prayse him for a worthy champion. He imagineth that we reply, that Luther and Caluine did so change popish religion, as Christ and his Apostles did chaūge the Iewish religion, and then he layeth

eth on lode, that Luther and Caluines authoritie is not like to Christes, whereas we make no such comparison: but affirme, that these godly preachers were sent of God, so to reueale and discouer the idolatry & corruptions, mayntayned in the Church, as Elias, Elizeus, Oseas and the other Prophets, were sent to restore and reforme the true worship of God, corrupted and decayed amonge the Israelites, reprouing and reforming all thinges according to the infallible rule of Gods worde. And whereas he trifleth of the continuance of the sacrifice of Christ, according to the order of Melchisedech, I say it is horrible blasphemy, to make any successors vnto Christ in ỳ priesthood, which the holy Ghost sayth, he hath ἀπαράβατον, such as passeth not from him by succession to others, because he liueth for euer. And whereas he quoteth Irenæus *lib.4.cap.32.* and Augustin. *in Psal.33. de ciui. Dei lib.17. cap.20. cont. adu. leg. lib.1. cap.* 18. reade the places who will, and he shall finde, that these fathers speake not at all, of any propiciatory sacrifice of Christes very body and bloode in the sacrament, but of the sacrifice of thankes giuing, which the Church throughout all the world doth offer to God, in the celebration of the holy mysteries, for their redemption by the death of Christ. But it is sufficient for blinde and obstinate Papists, to see the bookes margent paynted with quotations of doctors, by them which peraduenture neuer turned the bookes them selues, but borowed their quotations of other men.

But M. Sander sayth, whereas we pretend that Luther and Caluine doe all things according to Gods worde, they are the more to be abhorred, not only because the one is contrary to the other, but also because they pretende to haue their doings figured and prophecyed in the Gospel, whereas there is but one Christ, which hath bene borne & dyed but once, therefore these men haue no power to abrogate the Masse, or to take away the key of auncient religion. To their dissention, I aunswer it is not in many poyntes, but in one & that not of the grea-

teſt weight as for their pretence of theyr doinges, to be figured or prophetied in the Goſpell, it is a dreame of M. Sanders drouſie head, for they make none ſuch, but they ſhew the abuſes of the Romiſh church, by the doctrine of Gods word, & by the ſame they ſhew the way to reforme them and this, to the glory of Chriſt, who dyed but once, they abrogate the Maſſe, by which it ſhould follow, if it were of any force, that he ſhould dye often, for without death & ſheding of bloud, there is no ſacrifice for remiſſion of ſinnes. *Heb.* 9. 22. & 26.

If we deny the Maſſe to be that, they ſay it is, he anſwereth: that as he doeth not reade, that the Ieuiſh prieſtes did erre concerning the ſubſtance of their publike ſacrifice. So is it leſſe poſſible, that the vniuerſall church of Chriſt ſhould erre in that publike act, wherin Chriſt is ſacrificed. Here is a wiſe argument, hauing neither head nor foote, nor any ioynt to hange togeather. For whatſoeuer M. Sander readeth, we reade that Vrias the high Prieſt, made an heatheniſh altar in the Temple, at the cõmaundement of the king Achas, & offered ſacrifice theron, 2. *Reg.* 16. VVe reade alſo in Ioſephus, that Caiaphas & diuers other of ỹ high Prieſtes were Saduces, which could not but erre in the ſubſtãce of their publike ſacrifice, when they beleued not the reſurrection. Seeing the end of theyr ſacrifices was, to ſignifie ỹ eternall redẽption by Chriſt. Now to the ſecond parte of the argument, I ſay the vniuerſall church dyd not erre, though the ſchiſmaticall ſynagogue of Rome departed frõ Chriſts inſtitutiõ. But M. Sãder chaſeth vs away, with this double negatiue, no no maiſters, Antechriſts you may be, chriſt you cãnot be. Gods curſe light on him, that would haue any other Chriſt thẽ Ieſus the ſonne of God & Mary, which ſitteth at the right hand of his father in heauẽ. But it is your Antechriſt of Rome, that vſurpeth not only the office, but alſo receiueth the name of Chriſt & God, of his Antechriſtiã Canoniſts, ẅ I know you will not deny, though your face be of braſſe, becauſe ỹ boks may be ſhewed to any mã ỹ liſt to ſe thẽ.

After

After his large excurſion, he returneth to D. Parker whome he would aduiſe to reuolt to the popiſh church, but he (God be thanked) hauing ended his dayes in the catholike church of Chriſt on earth, is now receued into the fellowſhip of the tryumphant church in heauen. I paſſe ouer how malicioufly he rayleth againſt the bleſſed martyr Tho. Cranmer, for defence of whoſe learning and godlines, I refer the reader to his ſtory faithfully ſet forth by M. Fox. All other Archbiſhops of Canterbury he ſaith from Auguſtine ſent thither by Gregory were of their popiſh profeſſion. Of a great number it is as he ſayth, but not of all. For the opinion of the carnall preſence of Chriſt in the ſacrament, was not receiued in the Church of England, for two or three hũdereth yeeres after Auguſtines arriual, as that Homely which that reuerend father Matthew late Archbiſhop of Canterbury, cauſed to be tranſlated and imprinted, doth manifeſtly declare.

And whereas hee ſcorneth at the perſecuted congregation of Wickleue, Huſſe, and the poore men of Lyons, boaſting of the externall pompe and viſar of glory that was in the Romiſh Church, I haue ſufficiently aunſweared before, that bothe the apoſtacy of the churh of Antichriſt & the perſecution of the church of Chriſt was ſo deſcribed & proficied before, that neither the one nor the other ſhould trouble any mans conſcience, w̃ the ſtraungens thereof, ſo long as the trueth of the little flock & the falſhod of the reuolted multitude, are manifeſtly tryed by the authoritie of the ſcriptures.

The concluſion of all his Preface is, that which was the cauſe of this treatiſe that there neuer lacked a chief Byſhop in Sainćte Peeters chaire, whoſe ſupremacy beeing graunted all other controuerſies bee ſuperfluous. Yea verely all Scriptures, Doctors, and Councelles be needleſſe, where there is ſuch a perſon alwaies at hand, who cannot erre in any thing that he commandeth men te beleeue or doe. And contrariwiſe if ther be any neceſſary vſe of ſcriptures, doctors, coũcels,

Learning. Tounges &c. there is no ſuch chiefe Byſhop on Earth. But what ſaye you M. Sander, did there neuer lack a Pope to ſit in Peters Chayre? Was that See neuer voyde many dayes, many monethes, and many yeeres togither? And when there was two Popes or three Popes at once and that oftentimes, who ſat in Peters Chaire? You will ſay one of them: but which you cannot tell. Whoſe voyce ſhoulde the people obey as Chriſtes vicar? The one curſed, the other abſolued: the one commannded, the other forbadde. Is not all your bragging of Peters chaire, and vnitie, thereby proued to be nothing elſe but a meere mockerie?

The Lorde Ieſus confounde Antichriſt with the breath of his mouth, and with his glorious appearance, and defend his Church in trueth and holineſſe, for euer and euer. Amen.

The firſt Chapter.

Sander. *THE ſtate of the Queſtion concerning the ſupremacie of Sainct Peter and of the Byſhoppes of Rome after him.*

Fulke. VPon our denyall of the ſupremacie of the Pope, and of S. Peter, he ſayth we deny all primacie and chiefe gouernment in the Church. Wherevpon he rayſeth three queſtions to intreate of.

1. Whether it be againſt the worde of God, that there ſhould be in his Churche any primacie or chiefe authoritie?
2. Whether S. Peter had the ſame primacie or no?
3. Whether the Byſhop of Rome had it after S. Peter.

To which we aunſwere with diſtinction of the words primacie and Church, that we affirme, there is a ſpirituall and eternall primacy of the vniuerſall Churche, which is proper onely to our Sauiour Chriſt, which neuer was giuen to Peter, nor to any mortall man. Likewiſe

wise we affirme that in particular Churches, there is & must be a primacie of order, which is temporall according to the disposition of the Church. And such primacie in the Colledge of the Apostles might Peter haue for sometime, but that he had it not alwayes, it appeareth in the councell of the Apostles in the 15. of the Actes of which Iames in a manner by all writers consent, was President and Primate: and vpon the controuersie beeing throughly debated, pronounced the definitiue sentence ιωκριτω &c. according to which the synodall Epistle to the Churches of Antiochia, Syria, and Cilicia, was written in the name of the Apostles, Elders and brethren.

But concerning S. Peter, M. Sander moueth newe questions. First whereas Christ promised that Simon should be called Cephas or Peter, whiche is a stone or Rock. Ioh. 1. and afterward performed his promise, whē he chose him to be an Apostle, Mar. 3. Luk. 6. And thirdly when Simon confessed his godhead, the reason of the promise was declared that he would builde his Church vpon that Rocke: the question is, whether Peter himselfe be that Rock, vpon which Christ woulde builde his Church, or Christ himselfe, or the fayth and confession of Peter.

M. Sander the spokesman for the Papists, passing ouer the second question, that is whether Christe himselfe whom Peter confessed, by this rock, denyeth the fayth or confession of Peeter to be the perfect sence of that promise, affirming the Rock on which the Church is builded to be S. Peter, not barely confirmed, but in respect of the promise past, the present confession, and the authoritie of feeding Christes Sheepe giuen him after his resurrection, of which foure conditions the Protestantes (hee sayth) doe lack no lesse then three. But what doe the Papists lack, when in there sence they exclude the rock Christ, the only foundation, then the which none other can be layde. 1. Cor. 10. 4. 1. Cor. 3. 11. by any wise builder of the Church. Yet seeing M. Sand.

is ſo deſirous to haue Peter to bee the ſtone whereof Chriſt ſpeaketh, laying firſt Ieſus Chriſt to be the head corner ſtone, I wil franckly yeelde vnto him, that which he coulde neuer win by force, that Chriſt ſaying to Peter, thou art Peter, and vpon this Rocke or ſtone will I builde my Church, meaneth euen Peter him ſelfe vpon whome he would build his Church, but ſo that he maketh not Peter a ſingular Rocke or ſtone to beare the whole building, (for then hee ſhould put him ſelfe out of place) but one of the principall ſtones of the foundation, euen as all the Apoſtles and Prophetes were, for ſo the holy Ghoſt ſpeaketh, Ephe. 2. verſ. 20. beeing builded vpon the foundation of the Apoſtles and Prophets, Ieſus Chriſte beeing the head corner ſtone in whome all the building beeing compacted, groweth vnto an holy temple vnto the Lord.

Nowe let vs conſider, whether any ſingular authority was committed to peter, when hee was willed to feede the ſheepe of Chriſt. M. Sand. ſaith yea, becauſe it was ſayd to him alone, feede my ſheepe, and no particular flock named, it muſt needes be ment the whole flocke. Marke theſe maine pillers of the popiſhe Rock. Chriſt ſaide onely to Peter, come after me Satan, for thou art an offence to me &c. Therefore Peter onely was an enemie of Chriſte. If the Pope muſt needes haue the one texte as peculiar to him, let him take the other alſo. Againe Peter himſelf ſayth to the elders, feede as much as in you lyeth the flocke of Chriſte 1. Peter. 5. Heere is no particular flocke named, therefore he meaneth the whole vniuerſall flocke. But he vrgeth farther, that as Peter loued Chriſte more then the reſt, ſo he did feede the flock of Chriſt aboue all other paſtors. But if labouring in preaching the goſpel, be the feeding of Chriſtes flock, not Peter, but Paule laboured more then he, and all the reſt of the Apoſtles. 1. Cor. 15. The anſwere of the Proteſtants to his demande, Why Peter alone in preſence of other Apoſtles was commaunded thriſe to feede the ſheepe, that by thriſe confeſſion and

iniunction

iniunction to feede, he might abolishe the shame of his thrise denying, and knowe that hee was restored to his Apostleship, from which he deserued to be depriued) M. Sand. hketh not for three causes. First he sayth, hee had not lost his Apostleship, because his fault was not externally proued, nor confessed in iudgment, nor stubbernly defended &c. as though Christ which knew and foretolde his infirmitie before he fell, had neede of externall proues, or a Commissaries court to depriue Peter of his office. O blockish reason. Although neither Caluine nor Beza doe affirme, that hee was altogither excluded from his office, by his fault, but that he deserued so to be, and therefore had neede especially to bee confirmed by our Sauiour Christ more then the rest as his offence was more shamefull then of any of the other. Therefore the seconde reason that hee bringeth of his restitution, if he had lost it is superfluous. Ioh. 20 For he was none otherwise restored then the rest were, but at this time especially confirmed, as his speciall case required.

His last reason is, that admit Peter had not beene restored before this time, yet nowe he was restored to a greater authority, then any other Apostle had receued at any time, and whereas we reply that all the Apostles were equall by testimonie of Cyprian and Hierome, he aunsweareth by distinction, forsooth that they were equall in Apostleship, and yet Peter was chiefe of the Apostles, and an ordinary chiefe shepheard or high Bysshop, wherein they were all inferiours to him, and hee was their Primate and their heade, and this distinction he promiseth to proue exactly heereafter. In the meane time it is a monstrous Paradox, that all the Apostles should be equall with Peter in Apostleshipp, and yet Peter be the chiefe of the Apostles. He that can proue inequalitie to be where he graunteth equallitie to be, and in the same respecte, is a straunge Logition. Fynally where as some men graunting Peter to bee the rock, deny the honor to his successors, he wil proue that

the Byshop of Rome and none other, hath all that authoritie which Peter sometime had, and consequently that the Protestants come neerer to the nature & condition of Antichrist, then any pope of Rome euer did or can doe.

The seconde Chapter.

Sander. *THat there is a certaine primacie of spirituall gouernment in the church of Christ (though not properly a Lordlynesse or heathenish dominion) And in what sort this Ecclesiasticall primatie differeth from the Lordly gouernmēt of secular princes, and how it is practised by the Bishop of Rome. Also the Apostles strife concerning superioritie is declared. That there was one greater amonge the Apostles to be a ruler and as a minister doe not repugne. The preheminence of Priestes aboue Kings. A King can not be supreame gouernour in all Ecclesiasticall causes, because by right and law he can not practise all Ecclesiasticall causes. The high Priest is preferred before the King, by Gods law. The euill life of a Bishop taketh not away his authoritie. The differences betwene the Bishop of Rome and temporall Princes. That Moyses was a Priest.*

Fulke. THe Ecclesiasticall gouernment of the Church is a ministery, or seruice, by the authoritie of Christ and his Apostle Peter: & therefore neither properly nor vnproperly a Godlines or Hetheniſh dominion, but altogether as vnlike to it, as our Sauiour Christ the paterne of all true ministers, was vnlike to an earthly Lorde or an Heathen Prince. But whereas M. Sander in the first sentence of this chapter sayth (*That no man properly can be Lord among the Christians where all are seruaunts indifferently, vnder the obedience of one true Lord and Maister Iesus Christ.*) he sheweth him selfe not only to be a Papist, but also an Anabaptist. For the cōmon seruice that we owe vnto Christ hindereth not, but that a Christian man may be Lord & King ouer his fellow seruaunts and brethren

thren in Chriſt, as properly as euer he might be before the incarnation of Chriſt: who ſaith himſelfe that his kingdome is not of this worlde: who himſelfe was obedient and taught obedience both to God and Cæſar, to eche in things that belonged to them: & that dominion which he forbiddeth vnto his Apoſtles, like to the princes of the nations. Luc. 22. Matth. 20. and which S. Peter forbiddeth the elders of the church. 1. Pet. 5. is not prohibited to all Chriſtians, but to the miniſters of the Church onely in reſpect of their miniſtery. And yet that there ought to be a gouernment of the church, & ſome kind of primacy alſo, it is cleerer by the ſcriptures, then that it neede any proofe, eſpecially ſuch ſlender proues as M. San. bringeth, & namely where he citeth this text, Feed my ſheepe, to ſignifie that Peter ſhould giue euery man his dewe portion & iuſt meaſure of victuals in cõuenient time: which thing neither Peter did, nether was he able to doe. And much leſſe any man in ſucceſſion to him, which is not equal in gifts with him. And therefore the example of a ſtuarde, who may prouide for a competent number of one family, is fondly applyed to make one Stewarde ouer al the worlde, beſide him that is almightie. For although the Apoſtles were not lymited to any certaine congregation, but were generall Embaſſadors into all partes of the worlde: yet were they not appoynted to giue to euery man his dewe portion, but to appoynt Paſtors in euery Church and towne for that purpoſe. Tit. 1. Actes 14. verſe. 23, & they them ſelues to proceed in matters pertayning to their generall Commiſſion.

And therefore although M. Sander in applying theſe woordes of Ieronime *Cont. Luciferanos*, which hee calleth, *Exortem quandam & eminentem poteſtatem. A certaine peereleſſe and highe power.* And of Cyprian lib. 1. Ep. 3. *Of one prieſt in the Church for that time &c.* True. Euery ſeuerall Paſtor, or as he tearmeth them parriſhe prieſt, dealeth more honeſtly then other Papiſts that drawe the ſame teſtimonyes, as proper to the Popes

ſoueraigne auctority, yet in that he argueth, that the like ſhould be in the whole church militant, which is in euery pariſh, it is out of all compaſſe of reaſon. For that which is poſſible in the one, is altogeather impoſſible in the other. And the argument is no better, then if we ſhould ſay, there is one ſteward in euery Colledge, or greate houſe: therefore there is is one ſteward ouer all the world. And wheras he would proue his matter good, by that *S. Mat. cap.* 10. rehearſing the names of the Apoſtles, calleth Peter the firſt: it is to childiſh & friuolous. For in euery nomber, one or other muſt be the firſt & it ſeemeth that Peter was firſt called to the office of Apoſtleſhip: therefore his primacy was of order & not of auctority. Nether is he alwaies firſt named, for *Gal.* 2. 9. where the queſtion is, of the dignity of the Apoſtles, Iames is named before Cephas, or Peter as he was indeede elected to be the principall miniſter at Hieruſalem, by conſent of moſt auncient writers, neither doeth it folow, that becauſe the high Prieſt of the old law was called *Princeps populi, A prince of the people*, therefore Peter was made prince of all Chriſtian men. For neither was the high Prieſt alone called the prince of the people, as M. S. ſeemeth to ſay: neither had Peter by thoſe wordes (feede my ſhepe) any auctority committed vnto him, more then to the reſt of the Apoſtles. As for the name of Lord, or tearme of dominiō, ſometime geuē by eccleſiaſticall writers to the Biſhop or his gouernment, we ſtriue not about it, ſo there be no ſuch dominion by him excerciſed, as Chriſt & his Apoſtles forbiddeth, & as we ſee to be vſurped and practiſed by the Pope of Rome, & his clergy, howſoeuer M. Sander in tearmes of diſtinction, would ſeeme to ſhadow it. But he will ſhewe out one of theſe places which we alleadge, as if it did vterly forbid all ſuperiority amonge the Diſciples, *Luc.* 22 that the eccleſiaſticall primacy is cleerely eſtablyſhed and confirmed.

Firſt he ſayth moſt vntruly, that we deny all ſuperiority amonge the Diſcyples of Chriſte as though we denied

denyed all gouernmente amonge Christians, excepte hee doe childishly vnderstande the Disciples of Christ for Ministers ecclesiasticall onely: and yet wee denye not all superioritie among them, but that kinde of primacie which the Pope claymeth, and tyrannically vsurpeth. Secondly he maketh a longe preamble before he come to the matter, that althoughe the Apostles did diuerse times striue for the primacie, as in the way to Capharnaum Mark.9 vpon the requeste of Zebedees wife. Mark.10. & after his last supper Luk. 22. yet Christ neuer denyed, that there should be one greater among them, and often signifyed, that the same shoulde be S. Peter, especially when he sayde, thou arte Peter, and vppon this Rock I will builde my Church. If you demaunde why they stroue for supremacie, when hee had determined it, he yeeldeth a substantial reason: because while Christe lyued vpon Earth, it was in his free choise to haue appoynted it otherwise, vntill at the last in the 21. of Iohn, he saide vnto him, Simon thou sonne of Iona. &c. By these it appeareth, that M. Sander confesseth that no text of Scripture proueth the supremacie of Peter more directly and playnely then this of Iohn 21. which when euery Childe seeth howe little force it hath to proue it, you may easily iudge that the Papists them selues againste their owne consciences, doe inforce all other Textes vttered before to establishe it. And namely this of Luke 22. in which he sayth, that Christ taking vppe the strife that was among his Apostles about the primacie, ended his talke at laste with Simon Peter, shewing him to bee that one that was greater then the reste.

What Asse if he coulde speake with mans voyce, would reason thus? that because Christe conuerting his speache from exhorting all his Apostles to admonishe Peter of his speciall daunger he stoode in by his infirmitie: signifyed that Peter was greater then all the Apostles. But wee muste heare him compare these words of Christe. Luke 22. with the words of S. Mathew

and Marke in other places, which he ſayth the Magdeburgen.cent. doth huddle vp,as they were al one,whereas they differ much.

The wordes of Chriſt Mat.20.and Mar. 10.are theſe: *VVhoſoeuer among you wil be greater,let him be your ſeruitor. And whoſoeuer among you will be firſt, ſhall bee your ſeruant.* In Sainct Luke 22.. *He that is greater among you, let him be made as the younger: and he that is chiefe, as he that miniſtereth.*. M. Sander will haue greate difference to be in theſe ſayings. Firſt generally that the former ſentence ſpeaketh not of the greatneſſe among eccleſiaſticall officers,but all Chriſtians,which is vtterly falſe,becauſe this kinde of greatnes is preſcribed vnto them to whome externall dominion is forbidden,But that is not to all men,but vnto the Apoſtles onely and their ſucceſſors: therefore this kinde of greatnes,is proper only vnto them./ For he ſpeaketh not of greatnes by humilitie onely,but of greatnes without forraine dominion and worldly dignity, and ioyned with ſeruice, which is peculier to the miniſtery eccleſiaſticall.Secondly he maketh ſixe friuolous differences,which either are falſe or elſe make no diuerſitie in the ſence of the places.

The firſt,Mathew and Mark ſpeake of any man. *VVhoſoeuer*,S.Luke of one man,which by the article ὁ is pointed out.If the article ὁ doe alwaies pointe one certaine man,it is ſomwhat that M.Sand.ſaith,but *If*,ten thouſãd times and more,(as euery man meanely learned in the Greeke toung doth know) it ſignifieth not one certaine man: then is this a fond difference.

The ſecond,the other ſpeake of a deſire to be great, *VVho ſo would be great*, S. Luke of the effect already preſent,*he that is greater*.But the the words of S. Matth. 18. ver.4.ouerthrow this differẽce,with the former: for ther ὁ μειζων the greateſte, is taken for any one that ſhall humble himſelfe, as a Childe, and not for one made primate of the Church.

The third difference is,that the letter ſpeake of him that would be μειζων great. S. Luke of him that is μειζων greater

greater, by which is mente the greateſt of all after the Greeke phraſe. But that μέγας in the others ſignifyeth the greateſt according to the Hebrue phraſe, it is manifeſt by the word vſed by both, which call him alſo πρῶτον the firſt or chiefeſt of all. Therfore theſe three differences are not worth three chippes.

The fourth, S. Matthew calleth him that woulde be great δοῦλος a ſeruaunte. S. Luke giueth no name of ſeruice to him that is greater, but he is willed to be yoūger or vnderling. Yet S. Luke in another place. Cap. 9. verſ. 48. calleth him μικρότερος the leaſt which ſhall be the greateſt. But what fonde quarrelling is this? Doth not the Pope call himſelfe ſeruaunt of the ſeruantes of God? by which he acknowledgeth that the greateſt ſeruice belongeth to him that claimeth the greateſt dignitie. though indeede, he yeelde no ſeruice, but vſurpeth all tyranny. Is M. Sander nowe aſhamed of that ſeruice: that the Pope by ſolemne title hath ſo longe profeſſed? As for a preeminence of order, we deny not but it was among the Apoſtles, & muſt be in euery ſeuerall company: although it be not neceſſary, that it ſhould be perpetual in one man, but as euery Church ſhall ordaine: but a primacy of authoritie ouer all the Church, we vtterly deny that euer it was graunted to Peeter or any man by our Sauiour Chriſte. M. Sand. *citeth Ambroſe in Luke 22. to proue it Qui lapſus es &c. Thou which didſt ſlide before thou didſt weepe, after thou haſte wepte, ariſe vpright, that thou ſhouldeſt rule others, who before haddeſt not ruled thy ſelfe.* Loe (ſayth he) Peter did rule others. A great myrracle, but doth it follow, that either he ruled al mē, or that he ruled his equals the Apoſtles, of whome the ſame Ambroſe ſayth, *De ſpiritu Sancto lib. 2. cap. 12. Nec Paulus inferior Petro quamuis is eccleſiæ fundamentum & hic ſapiens architectus ſciens veſtigia credentium fundare populorum.* Neither was Paule inferiour to Peter although hee was the foundation of the church, & Paul a wiſe builder, knowing howe to founde the ſteps of the people beleeuing. And again in his boke

« *de incarnatione Domini ca.4. Hic inquam vbi audiuit vos ea-*
« *tem quid me dicitis? Statim loci non immemor ſui Primatum*
« *egit. Primatum confeſſionis vtique, non honoris, primatum fi-*
« *dei non ordinis.* This Peter I ſay, when he hearde, but
« what doe you ſay that I am? immediatly not forgetting
« his place, executed his primacie. Verely the primacie
« of confeſſion not of honor, the primacie of faith not of
« degree. By theſe places of Ambroſe it appeareth, what
gouernment and primacie was graunted to Peter, and
how he exerciſed the ſame.

The fift differēce, *is that the other Euangeliſts ſay abſolutely let him be a miniſter & a ſeruaunt, in S. Luke it is ſaid, with a great moderation, let him be made as the younger and as he that miniſtreth.* If this be a good argument, to proue that the miniſtery is more truly a greatneſſe then a miniſterie: the Arrians may deny by the like, that Chriſt is more truely a man then the ſonne of God: becauſe Sainct Iohn ſayeth: we ſawe his glorie as the glorie of the onely begotten ſonne of God: O beaſtly abſurdity: and yet he ſayeth: *if any man ſay, that there was not one certeyne man greater amonge the Apoſtles, who might be as the younger, it is playne contradiction to Chriſt and he is Antechriſt.* But where on Gods name ſayeth Chriſt, that there is one certeyne man greater among the Apoſtles?

The laſt & the leaſt difference is, *that the greater man is euidently named a litle after, when Chriſt ſayth to S. Peter, Simon Simon beholde Satan hath deſired to ſift you as it were wheate, but I haue prayed for thee, that thy faith ſhall not faile. And thou being once conuerted confirme thy brethren.* Maiſter Sander aſketh what other thing it is for Peter to confirme his brethren, but to practiſe and exerciſe his greatneſſe ouer them? for euerie one that confirmeth is greater, then they which are confirmed. Who euer did reade ſuch impudent aſſertions? Peters faith was confirmed by Marie Magdalen: therefore ſhe was greater then Peter. Paule was confirmed by Ananias, therefore he was greater then Paule. Aquila & Priſcilla

confirmed

confirmed Apollo: therfore they were greater then he. To conclude if ὁ μείζων in S. Luk. 22. do necessarily proue that there was one certeine man among them greatest: thē ὁ μικροτερος in the 9. of Luk. 48. doth proue that there was one least among them. He that is least among you al (saith our Sauiour Christ) euen he shalbe the greatest. And least M. Sander should renue his differēce of μέγας & μείζων, it may please him to vnderstand, that the contention was among the Apostles, τίς ἂν εἴη μείζων αὐτῶν which should be the greater or greatest of them. Which question our Sauiour Christ doth not decide, if M. Sanders difference of μέγας and μείζων in this place may stande. Wherefore hitherto Peter hath found no supremacie, and muche lesse the Pope by prerogatiue of his chaire, who can not be sayd to sit in Peters chaire, except he taught Peters doctrine, which if he did teach as he doth ỹ contrarie, yet Peters auctority could no more be deriued to him, then the auctority of Moses to euery one of ỹ Scribes & Pharizees ẅ did sit in Moses chaire.

He citeth Ambrose to proue, that there is a prelacie or preferrement in the church, because he forbiddeth contention thereabout, as though there could not be a prelacy or preferremēt of euery Bishop ouer his church but there must be one Bishop ouer all the church. The like he alleageth out of Bede, which speakethexpressely of al the teachers of the church, & not of one Pope ouer all. The conclusion of his disputation is, that the ecclesiastical primacy doth in al points resemble (as much as it possible may) the primacy of Christ, & therefore he that denyeth the primacie among the Apostles to be a true primacy in his kinde is blasphemous against Christ him selfe. Nay rather, he that communicateth with any man, that which is peculiar to our Sauiour Christ, that he only shoulde, be as S. Paule speaketh of him ἵν' πᾶσι αὐτὸς πρωτεύων himselfe the primate in al things Col. 1. 18. which is ỹ head of his body, which is, the church is foūd a manifest blasphemer of our Sauiour Christ. But that they ẅ excel among ỹ Apostles, & their successors the Bishops,

may be humble and yet great after the example of our Sauiour Christ is no question at all. But that any hath suche greatnes in auctoritie, as our Sauiour Christ hath euer his whole Churche, is the thinge we denye. If Gregorie affirme that Peter by Gods commission had the primacie of the holy church, and was growne in power aboue the rest: it is no maruel, seeing he was so nere to the open manifestation of Antechrist, which succeeded him the next saue one: whose tyranny beganne to encrease longe before Gregories time: yet was he in his pretended primacie more modest, then any that followed him to this day: Vtterly refusing and condemning as prophane, proude & blasphemous against Christ, the title of vniuersall Bishoppe: which Ihon of Constantinople did vsurpe, and other Bishoppes would haue geuen to him.

And whereas M. Sander frameth an obiection of our part, that no man can be both a minister & a gouernour: therfore no ecclesiasticall minister can be a gouernour, he playeth with his owne shadow. For we deny not but a minister of the church which is a seruaunt, is also a gouernour. But we affirme that his gouernmēt is spiritual, not worldly: vnlike to the earthly gouernment of this worlde, euen as the kingdome of Christ is not of this worlde. But it followeth not, because that euery Bishop & shepherd is a gouernour: therefore there must be one Bishop and shepherd gouernour of them all, other then our Sauiour Christ the arch or head shepherd & Bishop of our soules. 1. *Pet.* 5. 4. & 1. *Pet.* 2. 25 M. Sander cōmendeth ỹ saying of Leo B. of Rome to Anastasius B. of Thessalonica. *Qui se &c. He that knoweth him selfe to be set ouer some men, let him not disdaine to haue some man preferred before him.* But he proceedeth: *sed obedientiam quam exigit etiam ipse dependat.* But such obedience as he requireth of other, let him yeeld himselfe. By this saying it appeareth, that although Leo take much vpō him, as to heare the cōtrouersies ỹ can not be determined by the Metropolitans, yet he acknowledgeth, that in equitie, he was bound

bound to yeelde that obedience to others, which he required of others, if he him selfe were in fault.

But M. Sander maketh an other obiection for vs, on this maner. The Princes of the Gentiles, doe also serue their subiectes in conseruing peace, keeping out their enemies &c. but the clergie must be altogether vnlike to temporal gouernours: therfore there must be no primacie or gouernment among them, although it be ioyned with seruice. Once againe I say, we make no such obiection, but we answere the Anabaptists that so obiect, that the gouernment of the clergy, as it differeth in matter which is spirituall, so also it differeth in forme & maner from the regiment temporall, which is with outward pompe of glory & with the material sword: & this with all humility & with the sword of the spirit. Contrariwise M. Sander answereth this obiectiō so as he both strengtheneth the hands of the Anabaptistes, & sheweth him selfe litle to differ from their opinion. First therefore he saith that *Christ forbiddeth his Apostles and Bishops such a dominion, as is vsed among the Princes of the earth, not altogether such as ought to be amōg them.* But that he speaketh not of tyrannical dominion, it appeareth by the title of εὐεργέται benefactors, which their subiectes did giue them, for their bountifulnes towards them in preseruing them from enemies, in peace and wealth. Secondly he sayth, *that although the King be neuer so good, yet it is not the Kingly, but the Priestly power, which God chose frō the beginning to rule his people withal. And although Kings serue Gods eternal purpose, & they are commaunded to be obeyed, yet the making of Kinges ouer Gods owne people at the first came not of God by way of his mercifull election, but by way of his angrie permission.* What Anabaptist could speake more heretically or seditiously against the lawfull auctority of Kings & Princes? But let vs see his reason. Nemrod he sayth, was the first King we reade of: which either by force vsurped, or was aduanced by euell men. I aunswere: if Nemrod was the first that vsurped auctoritie as a tyrant: yet was he not the first that exercised Kingly auctority lawfully ne-

ther was he ruler ouer Gods people. But what wil he say of Melchisedech, King of Salem, was not he elected of God at the first, both to be a King & a figure of the King of Kings, who should not haue had that dignity, if it had not bene of it selfe both lawfull and godly? Secondly he sayth God was angrie with his people for asking a King, when they had a Priest to rule them. I aunswere, he was not angrie for their asking of a King, but for refusing of a Prince ordeyned by him, which was Samuel a Leuite in deede, of the familie of Cohath, but no Priest of the familie of Aaron. For in his dayes were high Priestes, Eli, Achitob, Achimelech. But after the dayes of Eli, which was both high Priest and Iudge. Samuel was ordeyned Prince or Iudge of the people, hauing auctoritie aboue Achitob or Achimelech the high Priestes in his time, which were sufficient to decide the controuersie of the supremacie, if M. Sander, would geue place to the Scriptures. But who can discharge him of Anabaptistrie, where he deny eth the making of a King to be Gods institution, affirming it to be, *the fact and consent of men allowed in deede by God*, when the Apostle expressly sayeth, it is Gods ordinaunce *Rom.* 13? And where he sayth that Abel, Noe, Abraham, were directly from God chosen to be Priestes as Aaron, he sayeth most vntruly, for they had in their familie, the principalitie of ciuill gouernment as directly, as they had the Priesthoode. But neither of both in suche sorte, as Aaron had the Priesthoode: in whom the one was distincted from the other. And of Abrahã it is testified that he was a Prince ordeyned of God *Gen.* 23. 6. He setteth foorth the excellẽcy of Priests by their auctority in making Christs body, with their holy mouth, as Hierom speaketh. But that proueth not the supremacy of one Priest aboue al men, nor of one Priest aboue an other. As for the ordeining of Peter to be generall shepherd, and high Bishoppe of the whole flocke, by commaunding him to feede his shepe: when he can conclude it out of that Scripture, in any lawfull forme of argument, we will yeelde vnto it.

But

But this is intollerable impudencie, that pretending to ſhew howe much the Pope is more excellent then any king, he aſketh *to what Chriſtian king did Chriſt euer ſaye? As my father ſent me I ſend thee.* as though Chriſt had euer ſayde ſo to Peter in ſingular, and not to all his Apoſtles in generall. As my father ſent me, ſo I ſend you. *Ioan.* 20. Concerning the rocke that he woulde builde his Church vpon, and the feeding of Chriſtes ſheepe, and lambes: we ſhall haue more proper place to examine afterward, what ſupremacie they giue to the Pope or to Peter ether. His farther rauing againſt the dignitie of kinges, who liſt to ſee, let him turne to the 57. page of his booke, *cap.* 2. And yet I can not omit that he ſayth, that *the pompe of a king is moſt contrary of all other degrees to the profeſſion of Chriſtian faith:* and maketh worldly pompe as vnmeete for a king as for a Biſhop. But the Scripture (he ſayth) neuer calleth any king head of the Churche, nether doe we call any Kinge heade of the Church, but onely Chriſt: but in euery particular Church, the Scripture alloweth the king to be the chiefe Magiſtrate, not onely in gouerning the common wealth, but alſo in making godly lawes for the furtherance of religion, hauing all ſortes of men as well Eccleſiaſticall as ciuill, ſubiect vnto him, to be gouerned by him, and puniſhed alſo, not onely for ciuill offences, but alſo for hereſie, and neglect of their duties in matters pertayning to the religion of God. For although many ciuill Magiſtrats at the firſt, were enemies of the Goſpel: yet was it prophecyed, that kings ſhould be nurſing fathers and Queenes nurſing mothers vnto the Church. *Eſ.* 49. Againe it is an impudent and groſſe lye, when he ſayth that God was angry *becauſe the gouernmēt of the high Prieſt was reiected,* & a kingly gouernment called for. For they reiected not ỹ gouernmēt of the high Prieſt, but of Samuel ỹ Iudge: who was no high Prieſt, although he was a Prophet, nether was there euer any high Prieſt Iudge but only Eli.

But if all ſupremacie be forbidden ouer the whole Church militant (ſayth M. Sander) it is forbidden like-

wiſe,that there ſhould be any ſuperior in any one part of the Church. And this he proueth by a iolly rule of Logicke. *For the partes (according to their degree) are of the ſame nature whereof the whole is.* O ſubtile reaſon.by which I wil likewiſe cõclude,there may not be one ſcholemaiſter for all the children of the worlde: therefore there may not be one ſchoolemaſter for one towne in all the world.There can not be one Phiſicion for all the world: therefore there may not be a Phiſicion for euery citie: yea there can not be one Prieſt for all the Churches in the world: therefore there may not be a Prieſt in euery pariſhe.Againe he reaſoneth thus: *If a king be ſupreame head ouer his owne Chriſtian Realme. it muſt be by that power which he ether had before his chriſtianitie or beſide it. For by his chriſtianitie it is not poſſible, that he ſhould haue greater power then the Apoſtles had.* I aunſwer:the kinges ſupremacie is perfectly diſtinct from any power the Apoſtles had. For although he haue authoritie ouer Eccleſiaſticall perſons,and in cauſes Eccleſiaſticall, according to Gods word: yet is he no Eccleſiaſticall officer, but a ciuill Magiſtrate, hauing chiefe authoritie in all cauſes, not abſolute to doe what he will, but onely what God commaundeth him: namely to prouide by lawes, that God may be truely worſhipped,and all offences againſt his religion may be puniſhed. And whereas M. Sander inferreth, that an Ethnike Prince or Turke may be ſupreame heade of our Church, we vtterly denye to any ſuch the name of an head, which can not be a member, but euen an Ethnicke Prince or a Turke may be chiefe Magiſtrate ouer the faithfull, and make lawes for the mayntenance of Chriſtian religion, as an hypocrite Chriſtian may. They are alſo to be obeyed in all things that are not contrary to God.Nabuchadnezer, Darius, Cyrus,Artaxerxes,which were heathen Princes, made godly lawes for the true worſhip of God & furtherance of his people:as in the prophecie of Daniel, the bookes of Ezra and Nehemiah, it is manifeſt.S.Paule appealed to Nero the Emperor. Euſebius teſtifieth *lib.7. cap.24* that.

that the Chriſtians in a matter of a Biſhopps election, and for a Biſhops houſe, were directed by the decree of Aurelianus an heathen Emperour. And this notwithſtanding, the Church is alwayes vnder the ſoueraigne authoritie of Chriſt, and the ſpirituall gouernment of her ſeuerall paſtors and teachers, when Chriſt aſcending into heauen, ordayned for her edification and vnitie, and not one Pope ouer all. *Eph.4.13.*

But now he will enter one degree farther, and ſuppoſe, that a king may be as good as it is poſſible for any mortall man to be, or as any Biſhop and Prieſt is, yet he can nether baptize, conſecrate, forgiue ſinnes, praiſe, excommunicate, bleſſe, nor be Iudge of doctrine by his kingly authoritie. If he can doe none of thoſe: he can not be ſupreame gouernour in all Eccleſiaſticall cauſes. I denye this argument. For his ſupremacie is not to doe thoſe thinges, or any of them, but to prouide and commaund, that they may be doon as they ought to be. But he riſeth vp againe and ſayth, that whoſoeuer hath ſoueraigne authoritie, either in ciuill matters or Eccleſiaſticall, he may in his owne perſon execute any of thoſe thinges, which any of his inferiours may do. So he ſaith, *the king if he wil, may be Iudge in VVeſtminſter hall, ſhriewe and conſtable, yea he may play the tayler, maiſter Carpenter or tanner.* It is maruell he ſayth not that he may be both a king and ſubiect. *Likewiſe the primate,* (he might as wel ſay the Pope) *may helpe a Prieſt to Maſſe, cary the croſſe in proceſſion, digge a graue, &c.* I deny this rule to hold in all thinges. For there are ſome thinges, that the Prince may not doe for lacke of knowledge, and ſome thinges for lacke of calling, and yet he may commaund both to be done. For controuerſies of lawe he may not decyde, except he haue knowledge of the law, nor miniſter Phiſick, except he haue knowledge in phiſicke, yet he may command both Lawyers & Phiſitions to doe according to their knowledge, likewiſe to preache, baptize, &c. he may not, becauſe he lacketh calling, for none may doe thoſe thinges lawfully, but he that hath a ſpeciall cal-

ling,but he may commaund thoſe thinges to be done,& to be well done, according to Gods lawe, whereof he ought not to be ignorant, and for that purpoſe is eſpecially commaunded to ſtudy in the booke of Gods lawe, that not onely in matters concerning his owne perſon, but in matters concerning Gods honor, he may cauſe all men to doe their duetie. *Deut.*17.18. So did Dauid, Salomon,Iehoſaphat, Ezechias, Ioſias, commaund the Prieſtes to offer vp the ſacrifices and to doe their duetie,which it was not lawfull for their kinges to execute.

And is it ſo ſtraunge a matter,that a popiſh king may not commaund his Chaplayne to ſaye Maſſe, or to ſaye his Maſſe reuerently,and orderly as the lawes of popery doe require? if he may commaund ouer thoſe matters, which yet he may not doe him ſelfe, let M.Sander ſee how his rule holdeth, that whoſoeuer hath authoritie in any matters,may doe all thinges him ſelfe, which any of his inferiours may doe, or which he may commaund to be done, whereupon he concludeth, that *the king hath no right or ſupreame power at all in Eccleſiaſticall cauſes, (vnleſſe it be committed to him from the Biſhop)* ſo that a king if he be a Biſhops commiſſary,may doe that by M.Sanders exception,w̃ neither by commaundement of God,nor his kingly power he hath auctoritie to doe.

Another argument he bringeth as good as this, that the leſſer authoritie doth not comprehend the greater, and therefore M Horne muſt aunſwer him, whether to preache, baptize, forgiue ſinnes &c. be greater or leſſer miniſterie then the kinges authoritie. If it be greater:then it can not be comprehended in the kinges authoritie,which is leſſer. What that reuerend father the Biſhop of Wincheſter hath aunſwered, it may be ſeene in his booke againſt M.Feckenham. But to talke with you M.Sander, what if I graunt, that the Eccleſiaſticall miniſtery,is not comprehended in the kinges authoritie? will you thereupon inferre, that the kinges authoritie is not to commaund the miniſters of the Church in theſe matters, to doe their duetues according to the word

worde of God? In deede you conclude ſo, but your argument is naught. For the king is Gods Lieuetenant, to ſee both the Church and the common wealth to be wel ordered. And the ſame thing may be greater and leſſer then another in diuers reſpectes. As in authoritie of commaunding, the king is greater then the Phiſition: in knowledge & practiſe of phiſicke, the king is leſſe then the Phiſition. So in authority of cõmaunding the prince is greater then the miniſter: but in authoritie of miniſtration he is leſſe, and no inconuenience in the world, to the dignitie of ether eſtate or calling.

The Biſhop of Winchеſters examples, M. Sander ſaith are euil applyed. For they only ſhew what was done, and not what ought to haue bene done: and ſo for many circumſtãces are ſubiect to much wrangling. 1. For either he was no good Prince which medled with diſpoſing of holy matters, 2. or in that deede he was not good. 3. or he did it by cõmiſſion from a Prophet or an high Prieſt, 4. or he was deceiued by flatterers, 5. or he was inforced by neceſſitie. But all theſe quarells notwithſtanding, the examples of Scripture are ſo many, and ſo playne, that M. Sanders wrangling can not obſcure them. Dauid a good Prince, did well in appoynting the Leuits and Prieſtes to their ſeuerall offices, and forbidding the Leuits to cary the arke and the veſſells thereof without any cõmiſſion from Prieſt or Prophet, but onely by the word of God, not deceyued by flatterers, nor enforced by neceſſitie, 1. *Chron.* 23. 25. Salomon did the like about the temple. He depoſed Abiathar the high Prieſt, & ſet Zadoc in his roome. 1. *Reg.* 2. 27. *&* 35. And ſuch are ỹ examples of all the godly kinges of Iuda. which being cõmended in the Scripture, are not vncertayne, deceitful, or vnknown in their circumſtances: but much more certaine argumẽts for the authoritie of Princes in Eccleſiaſtical matters, then this text ẅ he citeth (*Feede my ſheepe*) to forbid them. But here he will aſke whether a Chriſtian king be Peters ſheepe or no? I anſwer by propriety no. but a ſheepe of Chriſtes as Peter is. Neuerthe-

leſſe,admit Peter to be a ſheepeheard, and the king to be his ſheepe, what then? forſooth it is againſt the lawe of nature,for a ſheepe to rule his ſheepeheard. I graunt in thoſe thinges in which the one is ſheepeheard, and the other a ſheepe.But I aſke of him, is not a king alſo in ſome reſpect called in Scripture a ſheepeheard? if he doubt,*Eſa.*44.28.and *Iere.*23.4.may reſolue him, and is not Peter and Paule in this reſpect alſo ſheepe? If he deny it:let the Apoſtles ſpeake for them ſelues: let euery ſoule be ſubiect,&c. *Rom.*13. If nowe I ſhoulde reaſon that it is againſt the lawe of nature, that the ſheepe ſhould rule his ſheepeheard: I am ſure he would anſwer with making a diuerſitie of reſpectes. You may then ſee what a wiſe argumẽt he hath made, that may be turned backe on his owne head Wherefore here is no ſuch impoſſibility as he inferreth.but that a King in ſome reſpect of eccleſiaſticall gouernment may be aboue his owne paſtor,as in other reſpect he is vnder him.

M.Sander will goe forward for all this,& putteth caſe that a Biſhop ſhoulde come to a Chriſtian King,as Ambroſe did *Ep.* 33. to the Emperour Valentinian offering his body and goods to his pleaſure, but the thing which the Emperour vnlawfully required, he would not yeeld vnto, what could the Emperour doe to him? He coulde not excommunicate him. And if he impriſoned him or put him to death:he did but as Nero or the Turke might doe.*Therefore if the King be neuer ſo much Chriſtened, hee hath no power ouer the Byſhops ſoule.* If it were poſſible for the Pope to require an vnlawfull thing: I might put the like caſe of his holineſſe. What if a Chriſtian man ſhould come to him &c.he might excommunicate him as Cayphas did all that confeſſed Chriſte: hee might impriſon him, as Annas did the Apoſtles: hee might commaund him to be ſmiten as Paſhur did Ieremy, and Ananias Paule &c. Therefore if hee were neuer ſo much a Pope,he hath no power ouer a Chriſtian mans ſoule.Marke the pith of M.Sand.arguments.

But if Auxentius the Heretike ſhoulde haue come to

that

the Emperour, had the Emperour none authoritie to call a synode to inquire of his heresie,& he being found an heretike, to haue condemned him therefore? In these doings he had done as Constantine about Arius, and Donatus, and not as Nero with Peter and Paule. But Ambrose his authoritie is cited *Ep.* 32. *Si vel scripturarum seriem &c. If we call to mind ether the processe of holy Scriptures, or the auncient times, who can deny, but that in a cause of faith, in a cause I saye of fayth, Bishops are wont to iudge of Emperours, not Emperours of Bishops.*

And who sayth the contrarye, but that in causes of faith, the Emperour is ordinarily to be instructed of the Bishops, and not the Bishops of the Emperour? Or that the Prince hath absolute authoritie in matters of religion, to doe what he will, when we say that in all thinges he must follow the direction of Gods worde, the knowledge whereof, especially in difficult matters, he is to receyue of the Ministers of the Church, as of the Lawyers the knowledge of law, although he be bownd to see iustice executed.

But M. Sander will know how a king shall correct or depose a Bishop. I aunswer, if his cryme be apparant, euen as Salomon deposed Abiather, if it be doubtfull, by order of iudgement and tryall according, of ciuill Iudges, if it be a ciuill cryme, and Ecclesiasticall if it be heresie that he is accused of, if he can not be condemned vpon iust tryall, he is to be absolued, if this will not satisfie the king, he hath no farther lawfull authoritie by any supremacy, and if he proceede further, he exerciseth tyranny. And Augustine doth iustly complayne of the importunitie of the Donatists, which when the cause had bene decyded by certayne Bishops, deputed by the Emperour, they would neuer be satisfied, but still appealed to the Emperour, & *accused the Bishops that were appoynted their Iudges before the earthly king.* M. Sander vrgeth that word vehemently, that he calleth Constantine an earthly king, and yet he is so blinde, that he will not see, that the same earthly kinge, which assigned those Bi-

ſhops to be Iudges, was ſtill acknowledged of all partes, to be the ſupreame gouernour. Ep. 48.

But omittinge the wordes of men, he will proue the dignitie of highe Prieſtes aboue faithfull Princes, by the authoritie of God in the olde Teſtament. *Leuit. 4.* Becauſe there God aſſigneth a ſacrifice for the ſinne of euery degree of men, according to their dignitie. And firſt beginneth with the highe Prieſt, next whom is the whole people, thirde the Prince, and laſt of all euery priuate man. There is no doubt but the highe Prieſt, as he was an image and figure of Chriſt, was chiefe in dignitie. Although in other reſpectes he was inferior to the Prince, as Aaron was to Moſes, Achitob or Achimelech to Samuel, Abiather and Zadoc to Dauid and Salomon. The like is confeſſed of euery miniſter of the Goſpell, and therefore the authoritie of Philo and Theodoretus which he vſeth in this poynt, might haue bene ſpared. And yet may a wicked miniſter be depoſed by a godly Prince. Abiathar in the temple, at the altar, in the holieſt place, and ſacrificing, was greater then Salomon, yet was he iuſtly depoſed by Salomō for his treaſon.

Maiſter Sander chargeth vs to affirme, that the euill life of a Biſhop, taketh away his authoritie, ẅ he denieth to be ſo, as long as the Church doth tollerate and permitte them in their places, whereupon he concludeth, that though the Biſhop of Rome haue neuer ſo much abuſed his office, yet he can not leeſe his primacye. In deede the abuſe of the man, taketh not away the authoritie of the office, but if the office be peruerted from the right vſe, and degenerated into an heatheniſh tyrannye, as the Biſhop of Romes place hath bene many hundreth yeares, the name of a Biſhop onely and that ſcarſely remayning, we iuſtly affirme that ſuch dignitie as that ſea had by conſent of men, it hath cleane loſt, by abuſe of their authoritie.

Moreouer he ſayth, it hath no coullour of truth, that we affirme the Pope to gouerne, not as a Paſtor, but to beare

beare a soueraintie, as Princes of the worlde, and that he will shewe by six differences, which he will consider in order.

First no man succeedeth in that chayer, by right of inheritance. The like I may say of the Germane Emperour, therefore this is no difference. 1.

Secondly it is not obtayned by right of battaile, inuasion or otherwise, but by election. So is the Emperour at this daye, onely by election. And if Maister Sanders be not to impudent, he wil not deny, but there hath bene bickering and intruding by force, into that chayre, and that is worse entering, by symony, murder, treason and deuilish sorcery. 2.

The thirde, nether childe, nor woman, nor Infidell, nor Catechumeni can be chosen Bishop of Rome. No more can any suche be chosen Emperour by the golden bull and lawe of the election. And yet seeing boyes are made Cardinalls, which be electours of the Pope, and elegible, there is none impossibilitie, but a boye may be chosen Pope, as well as a woman hathe beene Pope, Ione I meane. Iohn the 23. was condemned in the councell of Constans for an Infidell, which denied the immortalitie of the soule. 3.

The fourth, the election of the Bishop of Rome as of all other Bishops, pertayneth onely to Ecclesiasticall persons, a king may be chosen by the people without the Clergie. To this I saye, that the Bishop of Rome was wont to be chosen as well by the people as by the Clergie. And so is the Emperour chosen by as many Bishops as ciuill Princes, except in case of equalitie of voyces. Nether is the Clergye euer excluded in any lawfull election of any kinge where he is made by election. 4.

The fift, to omit the Bishop of Romes temporall dominion, which he confesseth to be but accessory to his Bishoprike, in his Ecclesiasticall gouernment, he vseth not that force and power which worldly Princes do. He compelleth none, no not ỹ Iewes in Rome to baptisme. 5.

No more doth the Emperour. But what meanes vseth he to depose kinges, & absolue their subiects from their othe of obediéce, where he iudgeth them for heretikes, how maketh he warres and setteth all the worlde in an vprore, to defend his vsurped dignitie & false doctrine? Doth he not by force compell Christians to his filthy Idolatrye, or els cruelly murdereth and tormenteth them?

6. The 6. the Bishop of Rome (as Bishop) neuer punisheth them with the materiall sword, which forsake his Church, No, but as Antichrist and a tyrant he imprisoneth them, hangeth them, drowneth them, burneth them, not as *a Bishop sayth M. Sander, but as a temporall Prince and Lorde, as Moses being one of the Priestes of our Lord was also maister of ciuill gouernment.* Behold, this deuisor of differéces at length maketh him a ciuill Prince and temporall Lorde, from whom he had labored by so many differences to distinguish before. But now lest you should espye his impudent conclusion, he draweth into a new controuersie, whether Moses were a Priest. And first he will proue that Moses was a Priest, by the Scripture *Psal.* 98. Where it is sayd, *Moses & Aaron in sacerdotibus eius*. If he will not allowe the Hebrue worde *Cohanim* to signifie Princes, as it doth, in diuerse other places, yet sayth not the Psalme that Moses and Aaron were both Priestes, but that amonge his Priestes they were suche as called vpon his name, and were hearde, and Samuel who followeth in the same verse, confessed nowe by Maister Sander to be a Leuit, forgetting that before he made him highe Priest. But farther to proue that Moses was a Priest, he citeth Augustine, Ieronym, Gregor. Naz. Dionys. and Philo, but all to small purpose for his cause.

It must needes be confessed, that Moses as all the Patriarkes before him, in their families, was a Priest, before the distinction of the two offices was made, when Aaron and his posteritie onely were chosen to bee Priestes.

After

After which tyme he was no longer a Prieſt, nether did he any thing as a Prieſt, but as a Prophet, and as a Prince. But admit, he were both a Prince and a Prieſt, yet he commaunded Aaron as a Prince and not as a Prieſt. For Aaron was highe Prieſt, and therefore coulde haue no Prieſt abouc him. By which it is inferred, that the office of a Prince is to commaunde the highe Prieſt, and ſo was it alwayes practiſed by all godly Princes. But Maiſter Sander returning to his laſt and leaſt difference, affirmeth that the Biſhop of Rome neuer condemneth any man for hereſie or ſchiſme to corporall death in his owne perſon, nor teacheth that they may be condemned of other Eccleſiaſticall perſons. But who vnderſtandeth not this mockerie? for as well it may be ſayde, the Kinge neuer hangeth any man in his owne perſon, therefore none are executed by his authoritie, as the Pope neuer condemneth any to death in his owne perſon, therefore he perſwadeth not his religion with fire and ſworde. But will the Pope and the Biſhoppe, that are ſo mylde and gentle, ſuffer them whome they condemne for hereſie to eſcape their hands, before they haue deliuered them to death? O cruell and ſhameles hypocrites.

Neuertheles Maiſter Sander ſayth, they haue power ouer mens ſoules by that which our Sauiour ſayd to Peter. *To the I will giue the keyes of the kingdome of heauen, &c. which wordes are deryued to the Biſhop of Rome, by meanes of the chayre of S. Peter.* A ſtraunge kinde of deriuation neuer touched in the Scripture, *to which words the ſayde Biſhop referreth all his power, where as worldly Princes appeale to the lawe of the Goſpell nether in getting, nor gouerning, nor eſtabliſhing their dominion and power.* Marke well this Engliſh Anabaptiſt. Is not this the lawe of the Goſpell?

There is no power but of God, and the powers that be are ordayned of God. *Rom.* 13. 1. for getting of dominion and power. And is not this the lawe of the Goſpell for their gouerning? that gouernours are ſent of God

for the punishment of euil doers, and for the prayse of them that doe well. 1. Pet. 2. vers. 14.

And for the establyshing of theyr dominion, is not this the law of the Gospel, giue vnto Cæsar the thinges that belong to Cæsar. Matthew 22. verse 21. And againe, we muste be subiect of necessitie, not onely for feare but euen for conscience Rom. 13. verse. 5.

As for the Popes pietie and lenitie, wherewith hee ruleth, when all the world seeth how proudely and tyrannicall yhe behaueth him selfe, it were folly to spend many wordes about it. As for his gentle tearmes of sonnes and brethren, wherewith hee saluteth Princes, and Byshops, and the seruaunt of the seruants of God, which he calleth him selfe: be simple and shorte clokes to hide his horrible presumption and tyranny, wherewith he not only most shāefully reuileth most Christian Princes, as it appeareth in that trayterous Bul, which came from him against our moste gracious soueraigne Lady, but also taketh vpon him to depose them from their estate royall, vsurping to him selfe the name of holynesse, of heade of the Church &c. of Christe, of God him selfe, and calleth Princes his vassalles. &c. of which blasphemies his Cannon Lawes are stuffed full. And therefore it is too farre in the day, for M. Sander to make vs thinke there is no difference betweene white and black, Pride and Humilitie, Gentlenesse and Crueltie, Holynesse and hypocrisie, fayth and falshode, vice and vertue.

The thirde Chapter.

Sander. *OF the diuerse senses whiche are in the holy Scripture, and namely about these woordes (vppon this Rocke I will builde my Church) and which is the moste literall and proper sense of them.*

To contend

TO contende about the diuersitie of senses, it were to take vppe a newe controuersie. I admitte that whiche Maister Sander confesseth, the lyterall sense onely to be of force to conuince the aduersary. And the literall sense not to bee alwayes according to the grammaticall sounde of the wordes, but according to the moste playne meaning of the speaker. As when Christe sayeth to Peter, To thee I will giue the Keyes of the Kingdome of Heauen, hee meaneth not materiall Keyes of Yron, but authoritie in the Kingdome of Heauen, as Keyes are deliuered by the Maister to his Stuard, but not as keyes of a citie are deliuered, which betoken the giuing of possession of that Citie to be gouerned by him which receiueth the Keyes (as Maister Sander sayth) For that was no part of Christes meaning, to resigne the gouernment of his Church to Peter, for such giuing of Keyes is of the subiectes to their Superior, but to make him one of the Stuardes of his great house, to open and shut, according to his apoyntment. Otherwise, onely Christ hath the key of Dauid, which openeth and no man shutteth, and shutteth and no man openeth Apocalips 3. verse 7. Fulke.

Likewise when he sayth: Thou art Peter, I confesse and agree with Maister Sander, that the lyterall sence is not, thou art a naturall stone, but thou art that towarde my Churche, whiche a stone is towarde the house that is builded vppon that stone. But so that Peter is not the onely foundation, nor the Corner stone, which is onely Christe, but one of the twelue stones of the foundation, as it may more playnely appeare in the Apocalips the 21. Chapter and the 14. verse.

Furthermore I confesse, that what soeuer by necessary conclusion may be gathered, of any true literal sense, is of equall authoritie in the word of God, with that is expressed in playne words. As the consubstantialitie of Christ with God the Father, the blessed trinitie, and such like,

But whereas M. Sand. ioygneth to these, not onely the perpetuall virginitie of the virgine Mary, which is not certainly, though probably to be gathered, but also transubstantiation, the sacrifice of the Masse, and Purgatory, against which the sense of the scripture is manifest, I will not admit them for examples.

But to come to his purpose, he findeth in the auncient Fathers, foure diuerse senses of these woordes (vpon this Rocke I will builde my Church) whereof three hee reiecteth, as vnperfect which haue auncient writers, as he confesseth for their Authors, the last hee hath no auncient writer to defende.

The firste, that Christe is that Rock on whome the Church is builded, which Augustine holdeth.

The second, that euery Disciple of Christ is the rock, which is Origens opinion.

The third, that Peters faith or confession is the rock, which is Chrysostoms iudgement.

The fourth, which is his owne, and therefore he calleth it the perfecte sense, is, that Peter concerning his office in Gods Church, through the promise of Christ which is past, and the faithfull confession of his Godhead, which is presently made, and the power of feeding his Sheepe, which then was to come, is this Rocke vpon which the Church is builte. Heere I wishe the reader to note, that the Papiste reiecteth three senses of three seuerall auncient writers, and maketh the fourth him selfe, that you may see, with what equitie they exclaime againste vs, if vppon neuer so good ground, we departe from the interpretation of the auncient Fathers. But nowe let vs see what reasons hee hath to confute these three Doctors oppinions as vnsufficient interpretations.

Firste he sayeth, If Augustines sense were true, all the three other shoulde be voyde, In deede his owne sense, vnderstanding Peter to be a singular Rocke, more then the other Apostles is made voyde thereby, as it is false. But the other two may stande very well

with

well with Auguſtines meaning, for hee meaneth not Chriſte barely, but Chriſte whome Peter and euery true Diſciple of Fayth confeſſeth, to be the rocke of the Church, Neither doth the worde *thou*, hinder this ſenſe. Seeing Auguſtine vnderſtandeth Peter to be a denominatiue a *Petra*, of the ſtone, nor the woorde, *I will builde*, for notwithſtanding he hadde begunn to builde his Church before, yet hee woulde builde ſtil, and that more magnificall then before.

The ſence of Origine hee reiecteth, as not literall vppon which I will not ſtande.

The ſenſe of Chryſoſtome hee refuſeth, ſayinge, the Fayth of Peter is not the onely Rocke, wherevpon the Churche ſhall be builded, for then it had beene buylte vppon the Fayth of Iohn Baptiſte before this time. A pythy argumente, as though there is any more then one Fayth Epheſians 4. verſe 5. whiche is the ſame in Peter and in Iohn, and in all the other Apoſtles, the ſame I ſaye in kinde, not in number. Neither did Chryſoſtome meane, that the ſingulare Fayth of Peter were the Rock of the Church, but the ſame one Fayth and confeſſion embraced of euery member thereof.

That he ſayeth *I will builde*, whereas hee had already begunne to builde, and did then preſently build, What inconuenience is it? but in a quarrellers minde. Hee ſpeaketh of the Future tenſes, to ſignifie the great amplyfication of his Church which he woulde make by the preaching of the Apoſtles.

But of all ſenſes Maiſter Saunder lyketh his owne beſte, as perfect and contayning all the other therein. For firſt ſayth he, if Peter be the Rocke, then Chriſte that made him is much more, as the geeuer and authour of his power. But I deny that Chriſte did giue the ſame that he is him ſelf, that is, to be the onely ſingular foundation, Rocke, and corner ſtone of his Church.

Secondly he ſayth, if Peter in reſpecte of his con-

feſſion be a Rock, then his confeſſion is a Rocke. But then ſay I, they that make the ſame confeſſion are as much a Rock as he.

Thirdely he ſayth, if Peter beeing captaine Diſciple of all that euer were, be a Rock, then all other Diſciples that are contayned in him as in ỹ chiefe, may alſo be this Rock. Who had thought Peter had bene ſuch an vniuerſal thing to containe al diſciples in him? Doth not this containe manifeſt blaſphemie? to make all Diſciples contained in Peter, whiche are contayned onely in Chriſte, as the members in their myſtirall body, whereof hee, onely is chiefe heade, Soueraigne, Captaine, or what other name of ſuperioritie can bee deuiſed.

But nowe that hee hath made ſuch a monſtrous iumbling of three opinions in one, he is not aſhamed to charge Maiſter Iewell, for leauing the moſte literall ſenſe, and mingling three, opinions of theſe foure in one, as though his ſenſe which is fartheſt of from the meaning of Chriſt, were the onely or moſte literall ſenſe. But ſeeing hee wiſheth Maiſter Iewell or any of vs to diſcuſſe the meaning of Chriſte particulerly with all circumſtaunces, for my parte conſidering all circumſtaunces, I think the moſt ſimple and plaine meaning of Chriſte is, that Peter it a Rocke or ſtone, vppon which the Church is buylded, but none otherwiſe, then euery one of the Apoſtles is, Ephe. 2. and 20. verſe, and in the Apocalips the 21. chapter and 14. verſe. Of which M. Sander alſo confeſſeth euery one to be a Rock in his kinde.

But nowe let vs ſee the fiue circumſtaunces, by which Maiſter Saunder will proue Peter for to bee ſuch a Rocke, as none of all the reſte of the Apoſtles is but he.

The firſte, Chriſte promiſed Symon before he confeſſed, that he ſhoulde be called Peter, whiche was the firſte cauſe of beeing the Rocke Iohn 1. Admit this to bee a promiſe, & not an impoſition of a name, in re-

ſpect of the giftes of fortitude & conſtancie wherewith he woulde endue him, this proueth him not to be a ſingular rocke.

The ſecond, he was named Peter before he cõfeſſed, which was the performaunce of the promiſe. *Mark.* 3. I dout not but that he had cõfeſſed Chriſt before he was made an Apoſtle, although he had not made that ſolemne confeſſion expreſſed in *Mathew* 16. Wherefore this circumſtaunce is a friuolous argument. And his brother Andrewe which firſt brought him to Chriſt, confeſſed Ieſus to be the Meſſias before Peter was come to Chriſt.

The thirde, when he had confeſſed the Godheade of Chriſt which was the fruict of the gift & of the promiſe, Chriſt pronounced him to be ſuch a rocke, whereupon he would build his church, which was the reward of his confeſſion.

But all the Apoſtles made the ſame confeſſion, therefore the ſame reward was geuen to all, that they ſhould euerie one be a rocke or ſtone, on which the church ſhould be builded.

The fourth, Chriſt prayed that Peters faith might not fayle, which was the warrant of the perpetuitie of his ſtrong confeſſion *Luc.* 22. Chriſt prayed for all his Apoſtles *Ioan.* 17. the ſpeciall prayer for Peter, was in reſpect of his greater weakenes, when he was left to him ſelfe.

The laſt, to ſhew what ſtrength Peter ſhould geue, to his brethren after his conuerſion, Chriſt bad him feede his lambes, wherby he was made ſuch a rock, wherby he ſhould ſtay vp his church, by teaching & ruling ỹ faithful, as whoſe voyce the ſheepe ſhould be bound to heare in payne of damnation. Firſt I anſwere, that the ſtrength or confirmation which he ſhould geue to his brethren, was not all one, with his feeding of the lambes, but was vſed to the ſtrengthening of his weake brethren, the reſt of the Apoſtles, whom after his maruelous conuerſion, he did mightely confirme, though in his fall he was

ſhewed to be the weakeſt of all. Then I ſay, the feeding of the ſheepe of Chriſt, was committed to him with the reſt of the Apoſtles, in which he had no prerogatiue of auctoritie geuen, but an earneſt charge, to ſhewe his greater loue, by greater diligence in his office. So that hitherto Peter is none otherwiſe a rock, then euery one of the Apoſtles is.

The fourth Chapter.

Sander. *DIuerſe reaſons are alleaged to proue (chiefely by the circumſtance and conference of holy Scripture) that theſe wordes* (thou art Peter and vpon this rocke I will builde my church) *haue this literall meaning, vpon thee ô Peter, being firſt made a rocke, to thend thou ſhouldeſt ſtoutely confeſſe the faith, and ſo confeſſing it, I will build my church: the promiſe to be called Peter, was the firſt cauſe. VVhy the church was buile vpon him, the Proteſtants can not tel: which is the firſt literall ſenſe, of theſe wordes, vpon this rocke will I build my church.*

Fulke. FIrſt it is to be remembred, that M. Sãder in the chapter before, reiecting the interpretatiõ of three of the greateſt Doctors of the church, Origen, Auguſtine, and Chryſoſtom, not only is bound in equity, to geue vs the ſame liberty which he taketh him ſelfe, but alſo to confeſſe, that theſe three principal doctors, following other ſenſes, then his, were ignoraunt of that which he & all other Papiſts, make to be the chiefe article of Chriſtian faith, namely of the ſupremacie of Peter, when they acknowledged not Peter to be the rocke wherupon Chriſt would build his church, and therfore would neuer haue ſubſcribed to his booke, which he inſtituteth the rock of the church. But nowe to the argument of this chapter. Chryſoſtom is cited to proue, that, where Chriſt ſayth to Peter, thou art Simon the ſonne of Iona, thou ſhalt be called Cepha, which is by Intepretation Peter, a newe name is promiſed to Simon, *in Ioan. Hom. 18. Honorifice &c.*

&c. Christ doth forespeake honorably of him. For the certeine foretelling of things to come, is the worke only of the immortal God. It is to be noted, that Christ did not foretell at this first meeting all thinges which shoulde come to passe afterwarde to him. For he did not call him Peter, neither did he say, vpon this rocke will I builde my church. But he sayd, thou shalt be called Cephas. For that was both of more power, and also of more authoritie. There is nothing in this sentence, but that we may willingly admit, Peter was not yet instructed that he might be one of the twelue foundations of the church, as he was afterward. And that Chrysostom iudged no singular thing to be graunted, by that saying of Christ *Mat.* 16. to Peter, appeareth, by his wordes *in Euang. Ioann. præf.* Where he applieth the same to Ihon. *Tonitrui enim filius est Christo dilectissimus, columna omnium quæ in orbe sunt ecclesiarum, qui cæli claues habet.* For the sonne of thunder is most beloued of Christ, being a piller of all the churches which are in the worlde, which hath the keyes of heauen. Neither doth Cyrillus, whom he citeth, make any thing for his purpose. *In Ioan. lib.* 2. *cap.* 12. *Nec Simon &c. And he telleth afore hande that his name shalbe Peter and not nowe Simon: by the very word signifying, that he would build his church on him as on a rocke and most sure stone.* These are the wordes of Cyrillus, but that he meaneth not his person, but his faith, he sheweth manifestly in his booke *de Trinit. lib.* 4. speaking vpon the text of *Math.* 16. the grounde of M. Sanders booke. *Petram opinor per agnominationem nihil aliud, quam inconcussam & firmissimam discipuli fidem vocauit, in qua ecclesia Christi ita firmata & fundata esset, vt non laberetur.* I thinke he called a rocke, by denomination nothing els but the most vnmoueable and stedfast faith of that disciple, on which the church of Christ should be so established and founded, that it should not fall. Here is an other principall Doctor ioyning with Chrysostom, against M. Sander, who affirmeth, that the rocke is nothing els, but Peters faith. After these he nameth. Theophylact and Euthymius two late writers, but he citeth

nothing out of them presently. But after shewing the force of Gods promise to be effectual, to work al meanes necessarie for the performaunce of it, he citeth out of Euthymius in Luc 6, that it was like, that in Ioh. 1. Christ promised that Simon should be called Peter, & in Luk. 6 called him Peter. All this needed not, we doubt not but Simon was called Peter. Yea but Cyrillus sayth *in Ioan. lib. 12. cap. 64. that he being Prince and heade, first cried out saying, thou art Christ the sonne &c.* Therfore he was head before his confession, by promise and name. I will not here say, how contrary M. Sander is to him selfe, which in the cap. 3. sayd, that his supremacie was graunted to him as a rewarde of his confession. But I will aunswere Cyrillus by him selfe, *in Ioan. lib. 4 cap.* 28 that Peter was *Ordine maior*, superior in order, to auoyde confusion, not in degee, dignitie or auctoritie. And whereas M. Sander vrgeth so vehemently, that the name of Peter was not geuen for his confession, but was singular to him by promise, so that it belonged literally to no Prophet, Apostle nor disciple but only to him, & his successors, it is a most fond & friuolus matter, for the name of Bonarges, was specially geuen to the sonnes of Zebedee, in respect of their excellent giftes, and at the same time that the name of Peter was geuen to Simon, which seeing it perteineth not to their successors, which haue not the same giftes, no more doth the name & dignity of Peter perteine to any that sit in his chaire, if euer he had any fixed chaire among the Gentiles, which by Gods ordinaunce, was appoynted to be the principall Apostle of the Iewes. Moreouer where he laboreth tooth & naile, to proue, that these wordes (vpon this rocke I will build my church) are to be referred to Peter, as I sayd before, I will graunt euen as muche. But that Peter by these wordes, was made a singular rocke more then all the Apostles, vpon which the whole church is builded, I vtterly deny, neither shall he be euer able to proue it. For it is an impudent lye, *that onely Peter at this time, had this high reuelation, to acknowledge Christ to be the sonne of God*

God. For he aunswered in the name of all the rest, who beleued the same which he in their name confessed. Did not Andrewe before Peter acknowledge him to be the Messias? Did not Nathaniel which was none of the Apostles, acknowledge him to be the sonne of God and the King of Israel. *Ioan.* 1.49.

But he reasoneth substantially, when he saith *thou only art the rocke, because thou alone hadst this name &c.* promised, thou alone hadst it geuen, thou alone didst confesse me, & to thee alone I say thou art Peter. As though a man may not haue a name, whose signification is common to many. Salomon alone was promised to be called and was called *Iedidiah*, that is the beloued of God, shall we therefore reason that Salomon onely was beloued of God, as for that he onely confessed, I haue shewed before, that it is false, for Christ saying, thou art Peter, meaneth not to say thou onely art a rocke, but thou well aunswerest thy name, which signifieth a rocke or stone, and I wil in deede vse thee as a rocke or stone, to builde my church vpon, yet not meaning the person, but the office and doctrine of his Apostleship.

But nowe hath M. Sander no lesse then 21. reasons, to proue that Peter is the rocke, here spoken of, ẅ althogh they may for the most parte be easily auoided, yet I will graunt that Peter is one of the twelue stones, whereupon the church is builded, but not the only stone.

Therfore his first foure arguments, I deny 1. Simon is alone promised to be called Peter, 2. he alone is called Peter, 3. Christ speaketh to him alone, saying. And I say to thee &c. 4. Christ sayth of him alone, thou art Peter, therefore Simon alone is the rocke of the church, let him proue the cõsequence if he can. The next 5. which proue that these wordes are to be referred to Peter, although that they be not verie strong, yet I graunt the wordes may be aptly referred to Peter, the reasons are 1. vpon the pronoune. The 2 the worde rocke of which Peter is named, 3. the conference of thé together, 4. the word I will build, 5. the word my church.

The 10, Argument I denye, that Christ. (by saying to Peter, Feede my Lambes, feede my sheepe) made him the heade stone of Gods militant Church nexte vnto Christe.

The eleuenth, that Peter is shewed to be the Rocke spoken of, by geuing of the Keyes, I confesse: ebut seeing the keyes are giuen to all the Apostles, this proueth Peter to be none otherwise a Rocke, then euery one of them, That Iohn receued the Keyes I shewed euen now out of Chysostome.

The twelfth, that the propertie of a Rock in constant withstanding of tempests, agreeth with Peter, I graunt and so it doth to the rest of the Apostles, for whome Christ prayed as he did for Peter, who also strengthened and confirmed their brethren as Peter did.

The 13. I confesse that hell gates shall not preuayle against the Church, nor against any member thereof, which is a small reason to make Peter supreame heade thereof.

The 14. which is the authorities of those doctors that teach Peter to be the rocke whom he nameth when he citeth their sayings, or quoteth their places, I will seuerally consider.

The 15. their reason also when I see them, to deriue Peters authoritie to his successors, I will waighe likewise.

The 16. the practise of 1500. yeares I deny.

The 17. I deny that all generall councells, or any generall councell for 600. yeares after Christ, acknowledged Peter to be the rocke in that sence, the Papistes do now.

The 18. if the confession of Peter be the rocke, yet it is none inconuenience, that the church shoulde be builded theron, which began to be builded on the same confession offered by Iohn Baptist.

The 19. though you confound the diuerse senses geuen by the fathers in your fourth sense, yet that proueth not your sense to be true.

The

The 20. seeing the Apostles are certeyne foundatiõs and rockes vpon which the church is builded, I confesse that Peter must needes be one, but that he was the most principall rocke in respect of his name Peter, which is a stone, I say it followeth no more then that Salomon was best of al men beloued of God, because of that name *Iedidiah*, which signifieth beloued of God.

The 21. that all the Protestantes doe not agree in the interpretation of these wordes (vpon this rocke I will builde my church) it proueth not your exposition, to be true, for neither do all the old Doctors, nor yet the new Papistes agree in one, & the same interpretation of this text. And oftentimes it may inuincibly be proued, that an heresie hath no grounde out of suche a text of Scripture, although the true and naturall sense thereof can not be found at all.

The fift Chapter.

IT is proued out of the auncient fathers, that S. Peter is this rocke, whereupon the church was promised to be builded, otherwise then M. Iewell affirmeth. *Sander.*

THat Peter was a rocke or stone, vpon which the church was builded, is graunted of vs, but that he alone was a rock for the whole church to be builded vpõ, we deny, and M. Iewell rightly affirmeth, that the olde Catholike fathers haue written and pronounced not any mortall man as Peter was, but Christ him selfe the sonne of God, to be this rocke, whereonȳ whole church is builded. But M. Sander will proue (if he can) out of the old writers, that not onely Christ is the chiefe rocke, but Peter also is an other rocke, so that the church by his doctrine, is builded vpon two rockes, and this he will shew, 1. by their words, 2. their reasons, 3. & by the same places which M. Iewell alleageth for the cõtrary opinió. *Fulke.*

The decretal epistles of Anacletus, Pius, Fabianus, &c. which in his owne conscience he knoweth to be forged,

he omitteth,and beginneth with Tertullian *De præscrip. aduersʃ.hæresʃ. Latuit aliquid Petrum ædificãdæ ecclesiæ Petram dictum?* Was any thing hid from Peter which was called a rocke of the church which was to be builded? This is graunted that he was a rocke or ſtone, whereon the churche is builded, and the ſame Tertullian in his booke *de pudicitia* ſayth, of this whole text, that this was conferred to Peter Perſonally, and perteineth to none other, but ſuch as he was, namely an Apoſtle or Prophet.

« *Secundum enim Petri perſonam ſpiritualibus poteſtas iſta*
« *conueniet, aut Apoſtolo aut Prophetæ.* For according to the
« perſon of Peter, this power ſhall belong to ſpiritual men
« either to an Apoſtle or to a Prophet. Where is then the ſucceſſion of the B. of Bome?

But Hippolytus ſaith: *Princeps Petrus, fidei petra.* Peter is chiefe, a rocke of faith. He meaneth a ſtrong preacher of faith not a rocke whereon faith is builded.

Origenes *in Exod. Ho.* 5. calleth S. Peter *Magnum illud &c. That great foundation and moſt ſound rocke, whereupon Chriſt hath builded his church.* But let Origenes expound
« him ſelfe in *Math. cap.* 16. *Si autem ſuper vnum illum Pe-*
« *trum arbitraris vniuerſam eccleſiam ædificari à deo, quid di-*
« *cis de Iacobo & Ioanne filijs tonitrui, vel de ſingulis Apoſto-*
« *lis? Verè ergo ad Petrum quidem dictum eſt. Tu es Petrus*
« *& ſuper hanc petram ædificabo eccleſiam meam, & portæ in-*
« *ferorum non præualebunt ei: tamen omnibus Apoſtolis &*
« *omnibus quibuſq; perfectis fidelibus dictum videtur, quoniam*
« *omnes ſunt Petri & petræ, & in omnibus ædificata eſt ec-*
« *cleſia Chriſti, & aduerſus nullum eorum qui tales ſunt, portæ*
« *præualent inferorum.* But if thou thinke the whole church
« is builded by God vpon that one man Peter, what ſayſt
« thou of Iames and Iohn, the ſonnes of thunder, or of
« euerie one of the Apoſtles? Therefore it was in deede
« truly ſayd vnto Peter. Thou art Peter & vpon this rocke
« I will builde my church, and the gates of hell ſhall not
« preuaile agaynſt it, yet it ſeemeth that it was ſpoken al-
« ſo to all the Apoſtles, and to all the perfect faithfull be-

cauſe

cause they are all Peter and stones, and on them all, the church of Christ is builded, and agaynst none of them which are suche, the gates of hell shall preuayle. By this you see howe Origen is none of his, howe so euer he abuse his name.

Next he citeth Cyprian *lib.1. Ep.3. & lib.4 Ep.9* which sayeth that the church was builded vpon Peter. Which we confesse as vpon one of the foundation stones, but the same Cyprian *De simplicitate prælatorum* sayth. *Hoc erant vtique & cæteri Apostoli quod fuit Petrus, pari consortio prædti & honoris & potestatis, sed exordium ab vnitate proficiscitur, vt ecclesia vna monstretur.* The rest of the Apostles were euen the same thing that Peter was, endued with equall fellowship both of honor and auctoritie, but the beginning procedeth from one, that the church might be shewed to be one. This speaketh Cyprian vpon the very text now in discussing.

Consequently he citeth Hilarie *lib 6. de trinit. Petrus &c. Peter lieth vnder the building of the church* and in *ca. Math. 16. O in nuncupatione &c. O happy foundation of the church in hauing the new name pronounced, and ô rocke worthie of the building of that church, which should dissolue the lawes of hell.* But the same Hilarie sayeth of Christ, *de trinit. lib.2. Vna hæc est fælix fidei petra, Petri ore confessa, tu es filius Dei viui.* This is that onely happie rocke of fayth, confessed by the mouth of Peter, thou art the sonne of the liuing God. And agayne, *lib.6. Super hanc igitur confessionis petram ecclesiæ ædificatio est.* Vpon this rocke of confession is the building of the church. And againe. *Hæc fides eccleſiæ fundamentum est, per hanc fidem infirmæ aduersus eam sunt portæ inferorum. Hæc fides regni cælestis habet claues &c.* This fayth is the foundation of the churche, by this fayth the gates of hell are of no force agaynst it. This fayth hath the keyes of the kingdome of heauen &c. Therefore not the person of Peter is the rocke, for all the church to be built vpon.

S. Ambrose hath the next place, whome he citeth

Scr.66. Si ergo &c. If Peter then be a rocke vpon which the church is builded, he doth well to heale first the feete, that euen as he doth conteyne the foundation of faith in the church, so in the man he may confirme the foundation of his members.

Of the auctoritie of this Sermon I will not dispute, it " shall suffice that Ambrose *in Ps.*38.sayth. *Quod Petro dicitur, Apostolis dicitur, non potestatem vsurpamus, sed seruimus imperio.* That which is sayd to Peter, is said to the A- " postles, we vsurpe not power, but we serue vnder com- " maundement. By this saying of Ambrose, Peter is so a rocke and foundation, as the other Apostles are, & not a rocke to beare all the building him selfe.

S.Basil is alleaged *in Conc. de pœnit. Petrus petra est &c. Peter is a rocke through Christ the rocke. For Iesus geueth his owne dignities, he is a rocke and maketh a rocke.* This proueth not Peter to be the onely rocke of the militant church, as M. Sander would make him.

After him he citeth Hierom *in* 16. *Math. AEdificabo ecclesiam meam super te*, I wil build my church vpon thee. Behold sayth M.Sander the church promised to be built vpon a mortall man. If he say true, Christ sayth in vaine that flesh and blood made him not Peter. But the same Hieronyme interpreteth that power there geuen, to Peter, to perteyne to euerie Bishop and Priest, as much as " to Peter. And *contra Iouinian lib.* 1. he writeth. *At dicis super Petrum fundatur ecclesia, licet id ipsum in alio loco super* " *omnes Apostolos fiat, & cunctis claues regni cælorum acci-* " *piant, & ex æquo super eos ecclesiæ fortitudo solidetur: tamen propterea inter duodecim vnus eligitur vt capite cõstituto scismatis tollatur occasio:* But thou sayest the church is " founded vpon Peter, although in an other place the " same is done vpon al ỹ Apostles, & they al receaued the " keyes of the kingdom of heauen, & the strength of the " church is grounded equally vpon thé, yet for this cause, " one is chosen among the twelue, that the heade being " appoynted, occasion of diuision might be taken away. You see now that Peter is no more a rock or fundation, then

then the reſt, neither hath any more auctoritie of the keyes then the reſt, although by his iudgement, he was choſen to be the chiefe or firſt in order to auoyde ſtrife, not in dignitie or auctority. Chryſoſtom is cited *ex Var. in Math. Hom.* 27. *Princeps &c. Peter Prince of the Apoſtles, vpon whome Chriſt founded the church, a verie immoueable rocke and a ſtrong confeſſion.* M. Sander woulde haue vs note, that Peter is called confeſſion, that when he ſayth the church is builded vpon faith & confeſſion, we might vnderſtand no mans faith and confeſſion, but Peters. As though all the Apoſtles had not the ſame faith & made not the ſame cõfeſſion. But notwithſtãding that Chryſoſtom doth oftẽ acknowledge Peter to be the Prince of the Apoſtles, yet he willeth vs, to cõſider that his principallity was not of auctority but of order. *Iam & illud conſidera, quàm & Petrus agit omnia ex communi diſcipulorum ſententia, nihil auctoritate ſua, nihil cum imperio.* Now alſo cõſider this, how euen Peter doth all things by the cõmon decree of the diſciples, nothing by his owne auctority, nothing by commaundement. *Ex. Act. Ho.* 3. Alſo in 2. *ad Gal.* he doth not only affirme that Paule was equall in honor with Peter, but alſo that all the reſt were of equall dignitie. *Iamque ſe cæteris honore parem oſtendit, nec ſe reliquis illis, ſed ipſi ſummo comparat, declarans quod horum vnuſquiſq; parem ſortitus ſit dignitatẽ.* And now Paule ſheweth him ſelfe equall in honor with the reſt, neither doth he cõpare him ſelfe with the reſt, but euen with the higheſt himſelfe, declaring that euery one of thẽ hath obteined equal dignity. Now followeth, Epiphanius *in Anchor. Ipſe dominus &c. The Lord himſelfe did conſtitute him chiefe of the Apoſtles, a ſure rocke vpon which the church of God is buylt, and the gates of hell ſhall not preuayle againſt it: now the gates of hell are hereſies and auctors of hereſies, for by all meanes faith in him was eſtabliſhed which receaued the keye of heauen.* That Peter was chiefe of ỹ Apoſtles in order, we ſtriue not, that he was a ſure rocke we graunt, but that he alone was the rocke of the church we deny. The ſame Epiphanius acknowled-

geth the Bishop of Rome to be fellow minister with euery Bishop, and no better, and therefore setting forth the epistle of Marcellus to Iulius Bishop of Rome, he giueth this superscriptiō. *Beatissimo cōministro Iulio, Marcellus in Domino gaudium.* To his most blessed fellow minister Iulius, Marcellus wisheth ioy in the Lord.

The place of Cyrillus which followeth, I haue sette downe, and aunswered in the chapter before.

After him Theodoretus alleageth Pſellus. *In Petro &c. In Peter the prince of the Apostles, our Lord in the Gospells hath promised that he will build his Church.* Damascen and Euthymius later writers are alledged to the like effect, all which proue nothing but that Peter is a rocke, which we confesse as euery one of the Apostles is.

Thē followeth Augustine in his retractations, which leaueth it to the choyce of the reader, whether he will vnderstand Peter figuring the person of the Church, to be the rocke spoken of by Christ, or Christ whō he cōfessed. But that Peter as Bishop of Rome, should be the rocke he sayth nothing. Againe leauing it to the readers choyse, he sheweth he had no such perswasion of the rocke of the Church, as M. Sander teacheth.

After him Prosper Aquitanicus, & Leo with Gregory two Bishops of Rome, say nothing but that Peter was a rocke, which we graunt without controuersie.

Last of all the councell of Chalcedon is cited. *Act. 3. Petrus Apostolus est petra & crepido Ecclesiæ.* Peter the Apostle is a rocke and a shoare of the Churche, which M. Sander translateth the toppe of the Church. In deede the legats of the Bishop of Rome vttered such words, which may be well vnderstoode as all the rest of the fathers, that Peter was one of the twelue foundations of the Churche. But that the councell acknowledged not the Bishop of Rome to haue such authoritie as is pretended, appeareth by the 16. action of the Chalcedon councell, where notwithstanding the B. of Romes Legats reclaymed, & Leo him selfe refused to consent,

yet

yet by the whole councell it was determined, that the Archbishop of Constantinople should haue equall authoritie with the Archbishop of Rome in the East, onely the title of prioritie or senioritie reserued to the Bishop of Rome.

To conclude, M. Iewell sayd truly, for all M. Sanders vaine & childishinsulting & impudent rayling, ỹ no mor tall mā, but Christ only is the rocke & foundation of the Church, albeit that Peter & all the Apostles in respect of their office, & doctrine, were foūdation stones wheron the Church was builded, Iesus Christ being the corner stone and onely one generall foundation.

The sixt chapter.

THe diuerse reasōs which the fathers bring to declare why S. Peter was this rocke, do euidently shew that he was most literally this rocke, whereupon Christ would build his Church. How Peter beareth the person of the Church. Sander.

THat he was a stone or rocke, wheron the Church is builded, hath bene often graunted, but that he onely was such a stone is stil denyed. First Basil *aduersus Eunom. lib. 2.* is cited, with his reason *Petrus &c. Peter receyued the building of the Church vpon him selfe, for the excellencye of his faith.* I aunswer, so did the other Apostles for the excellencye of their fayth, for continuance whereof, Christ prayed as well as for Peters faith. *Iohn. 17.* Fulke

The 2. Hilarie *de trinit. lib. 6.* sayth *Supereminentem &c. Peter by confession of his blessed faith, deserued an exceding glory.* And so did the rest of the Apostles by their confession of their blessed faith, obtaine an exceding or passing glory, *vltra humanæ infirmitatis modū*, beyond ỹ measure of mans infirmitie, ẅ wordes also Hilary hath, lest » you should thinke he preferreth Peter in auctoritie before ỹ other Apostles. For Peters fayth & confession he did before interprete to be the rocke of the Church, ẅ

becauſe it was common to all the Apoſtles, he maketh their authoritie equall. *Vos ô ſancti & beati viri, ob fidei veſtræ meritum claues regni cælorum ſortiti, & ligandi atque ſoluendi in cælo & in terra ius adepti.* O you holy and bleſſed men, which for the worthines of your faith haue obtayned the keyes of the kingdom of heauen, and haue attayned to auctoritie to bind and looſe in heauen and in earth. And if you vrge that Peter ſpake, when all the reſt helde their peace: yet is that primacye but of order, not of authoritie. for they all beleued as Peter confeſſed, and Peter confeſſed in the name of all the reſt.

The 3. Cyprian *ad Iubaianum: Eccleſia quæ eſt vna &c.* The Churche which is one, is founded by our Lordes voyce, vpon one which hath receyued the keyes of it. This reaſon (ſayth he) can beare but one ſuch rocke, for if there were more rocks at once, there ſhould be more churches But it is reaſon, that Cyprian ſhould expound him ſelfe, which by founding meaneth the beginning of the foundation, as he ſayth, *de ſimplicitate prælat. Loquitur Dominus ad Petrum &c.* The Lorde ſpeaketh to Peter. I ſay to thee (ſayth he) that thou art Peter, and vpon this rocke I will build my Church, and the gates of hell ſhall not preuayle againſt it. To thee will I giue the keyes of the kingdom of heauen, and whatſoeuer thou ſhalt bind vpon earth, ſhall be bound in heauen: and whatſoeuer thou ſhall looſe on earth, ſhall be looſed in heauen. And to the ſame after his reſurrection, he ſayth: Feede my ſheepe. And although he giueth to all his Apoſtles after his reſurrection equall power, and ſayth, as my father hath ſent me, ſo alſo doe I ſende you, receyue the holy Ghoſt. Whoſe ſinnes you forgiue they ſhall be forgiuen, and whoſe ſinnes you retayne they ſhall be retayned: yet that he might ſhewe the vnitie, by his authoritie, he diſpoſed the beginning of the ſame vnitie, beginning at one. For verely the reſt of the Apoſtles, were euen the ſame thing that Peter was, endued with equall fellowſhip both of honour and of power: but the beginning

procedeth

procedeth from vnitie, that the Church might be shewed to be one. Thus farre Cyprian. By which we see that there is but one beginning, yet all the Apostles are equall. This vnitie of beginning of building, Tertullian also *lib. de pudic.* sheweth to haue bene in Peter, when he was the first that preached after the ascention of Christ.

The 4. Augustine *Hom. de pastoribus, Dominus &c.* Our Lord hath commended vnitie in Peter him selfe: there were many Apostles, and it is sayde to one, feede my sheepe. Here he will haue Peter to represent Christ, the onely good shepeheard: although the wordes importe no such thing, but onely a mystery of vnitie, which is but friuolously gathered by the author of that booke, or homely, vntruly ascribed to S. Augustine: where yet he will not haue Peter to be the head, but to beare a figure of the body of Christ, which is the Church. Whereupon his wordes follow soone after. *Nam & ipsum Petrum cui commendauit oues suas, quasi alter alteri vnum secum facere volebat, vt sic ei oues commendaret, vt esset ille caput, ille figuram corporis portaret, id est Ecclesiæ, & tanquam sponsus & sponsa essent duo in carne vna.* For he would make euen Peter to whome he commended his sheepe, as one to another, one with him selfe, that he might so commend his sheepe to him, that he him selfe might be the heade, and Peter might beare the figure of his body, that is, of his Church, and so they might be as the bridegrome & his spouse, two in one flesh. These words shew how vaine M. Sanders collection is for Peters headship, beside that he citeth the wordes otherwise then they are in the author, euen as his note booke serued him.

The 5. reason is vttered by Hierome *aduersus Iouinianum lib. 1.* aunswering the obiection of Iouinian, and intending to proue that Iohn the virgine was as excellent as Peter the maried man. *At dicis, &c.* But thou sayst, the Church is built vpon Peter: *Albeit the selfe same thing in another place, be done vpon all the Apostles, & all doe receiue the keyes of the kingdom of heauen, and the strength of the*

Church be grounded equally vpon them, yet therefore one is choſen among twelue, that a head being made, the occaſion of ſchiſme may be taken away. Here he woulde haue three thinges to be noted. Firſt that the Church is ſo built vpon Peter the rocke, that in the ſame place where it is built vpon Peter, the like is not done vpon the other Apoſtles. But ſeeing he him ſelfe before vrged the future tence, I will build, this collection is falſe. Chriſt promiſeth that he will builde his Church vpon Peter, but when he buildeth, he vſeth all the Apoſtles as well as Peter.

Secondly that the church is equally built vpon all the Apoſtles, therefore not more on Peter then on the reſt.

Thirdly that one is choſen head to auoyde ſchiſme.

But if all be equall, he aſketh how one may be head? I aunſwer, euen as the foreman of the Iury in ſome reſpectes is chiefe, and yet they are all equall. Bnt he aunſwereth they are equall in authoritie, as Apoſtles, but not as Biſhops. But ſeeing the office of euery Apoſtle is aboue the office of euery Biſhop, it will followe, that euery Apoſtle as Apoſtle, is aboue Peter as Biſhop of Rome, which were a perilous matter for Maiſter Sander to admitte. Howbeit concerning this diſtinction of his, more is to be ſayd in a more proper place. In the meane tyme, he vrgeth, that Peter was choſen of Chriſt to be heade, to auoyde ſtrife and ſchiſme, which reaſon ſeeing it holdeth alwayes, there ought alwayes one heade to be choſen, to be a heade and perpetuall rocke, by ſucceſſion. I aunſwer the reaſon of auoyding ſchiſmes, may gayne ſo much, that in euery Church, ſuch as the firſt of the Apoſtles was, ſuch an head for ſuch purpoſe may be choſen, but it will not inforce one heade being a mortall man, ouer all the Churche, which no one man can keepe in vnitie, and how conuenient the headſhip of the Romiſh Church is to auoyde ſchiſmes, let ſo many ſchiſmes as haue bene made euen for the attayning of the ſame headſhip, beare witnes. Whereof one continued 39. yeares.

As for Leo Biſhop of Rome, it is well knowen, hee was too much addicte to maintaine the dignitie of his Sea, and yet he was farre from the tyranny which the later byſhops vſurped and practiſed vnder pretence of Peters ſupremacie. His words are cited in Ann. aſſ. ſer. 3. *Super hoc Saxum &c. Vppon this ſtone, this ſoundnes and ſtrength, I will builde an euerlaſting temple, and the highs of my Church, which is to reach to Heauen, ſhall riſe in the ſtrength of this Rocke.* A great extolling of Peter, vſuall to the Byſhops of Rome, but yet no more is ſaide of him then may be truely ſaide vpon euery one of the Apoſtles.

The 6. reaſon is vttered by Auguſtine. Ep. 165. *Petro totius eccleſiæ figuram. &c. Our Lorde ſaide to Peter bearing the figure of the whole Church. vppon this rocke I will builde my church.* And againe in Ioan Tr. 124. *Eccleſia &c. Peter the Apoſtle by a generalitie that was figured, did beare the perſon of the Church, by reaſon of the primacie of his Apoſtleſhip.* Heere he maketh much adoe aboute his primacie, by reaſon whereof he beareth the figure of all the Church, willing to inferre that becauſe hee was primate of the Apoſtles, and in reſpect of his primacy repreſented the whole Church, therefore he was ſoueraigne ruler and generall officer of the whole militant Church. But it followeth not, that euery one which is made an atturney or Proxei to receiue a thing for a whole comminaltie, is thereby made generall ruler of al that comminaltie.

The Papiſtes them ſelues in the Councell of Baſill diſcharge vs of this concluſion, where they agree to the ſentence of Iohn Patriarch of Antiochia which citeth Auguſtine to witneſſe that Peter receiued the Keyes as miniſter of the Church.

And Auguſtine writeth De Agone Chriſt. cap. 30 *Non enim ſine cauſa inter omnes Apoſtolos huius eccleſiæ Catholicæ perſonam ſuſtinet Petrus, Huic enim eccleſiæ claues regni cælorum datæ ſunt. Et cum ei dicitur ad omnes dicitur, Amas me, Paſce oues meas.* For not without cauſe

" *amonge all the Apostles, Peeter sustaineth the person*
" *of this Catholike Churche. For to this Churche the Keyes*
" *of the kindome of Heauen are giuen. And when it is saide*
" *vnto him, it is saide to all. Doest thou loue me? feede my*
" *sheepe.*

By this sentence it is playne, that Christe after Augustines minde, preferred not Peter in power before all the rest, but to receiue equall power with the reste, hee made him as it were the Attornye of the rest. So that all these reasons duely considered, the sayinges of the Doctors which affirme Peter to be a rocke or stone, on which the Church is builded, doe not prooue that hee was an onely foundation of the whole Church, but with the rest of the apostles, he was one and the firste of the twelue stones, whereon the Church was founded, and that in respect of his office and doctrine, not of his person, as he wasa mortal man.

The seuenth Chapter.

Sander. *THE authorities alleadged by M. Iewell, to proue that Peter was not this Rock, proue against him self that Peter was this Rocke, although they proue that there was an other kinde of Rock also beside him, which thinge wee denye not.*

Fulke. THE first authoritie is Gregorius Nyssenus *in loc. vet. test.* Thou art Peter, and vpon this rock I will
" build my church. He meaneth the confession of Christ.
" For he had sayd before: Thou art Christe the sonne of
" the liuing God. M.S. replieth that it is neither said, that Peter was not this Rock: nor that Christ was this rock. But that the confession of Peter was the Rock, whiche he graunteth, and therefore Peter much rather muste be the rock. *For his confession which commeth from his soule and heart, as from a fountaine or springe, is greater then the acte of confession.* Firste I deny his Argument: becaus

Peters

Peters confeſſion came neither from his ſoule nor hart, but from God, which reuealed the trueth vnto him, as Chriſt ſaith. Fleth and bloode &c. Secondly I ſay, Gregory meaneth by Peters confeſſion, him which Peter confeſſed, namely Chriſte which is the onely Rocke of the Church, whereon the whole Church is builded, as his wordes doe ſounde, for he had ſayde before: Thou art Chriſt &c.

But M. Sander reaſoning like a learned Clarke, findeth faulte with M. Iewels argumente, comparing it to this: *There commeth eloquence from a man but he is not eloquent: Peters confeſſion is the Rocke, therefore Peter is not the Rocke.* Would a man thinke that a Doctor in Diuitie, ſhould either be ſo ignoraunt in the Arte of reaſoning, or ſo impudent in peruerting a good reaſon, that a very Childe might reproue, either the one or the other? I appeale to Logicians, whether this reaſon of M. Iewels: The Rock commeth from Peter by confeſſion, Ergo, Peter is not the Rock: be like this argument Eloquence commeth from Cicero, therefore Cicero is not Eloquence, and not as M. Sand. inferreth: Ergo, Cicero is not Eloquent. But he hath another Example. *A mans Oration is eloquent, therefore the man him ſelfe is eloquent: So Peters confeſſion is the Rocke, therefore Peter himſelfe is the Rocke.* I deny the reſemblance, for there is reſembled the Adiectiue in the one, and the ſubſtantiue in the other. But thus he ſhoulde compare them, Tullyes defence of Mylo is an eloquent oration: therefore Tully is an eloquent Oration, which reaſoning is no more abſurde, then this of M. Sand. Peters confeſſion is the Rocke, therefore Peter is the Rocke. Contrarywiſe you may reaſon: Peters confeſſion was the Rock, therefore Peter was Rockey or ſtony.

The ſeconde authoritie is Hilarie. *Hæc vna eſt &c.* This is that onely bleſſed rock of Faith that Peter confeſſed with his mouth. M. Sander caueleth, that this » is not ſpoken vpon the wordes ſaid to Peter, but vpon the wordes ſpoken by Peter. But beſide that the whole

context of the place is againſt him, both in that, lib. 2. De trinit. and alſo lib. 6. *Super hanc confeſſionis Petram eccleſiæ edificato eſt*, vpon this Rock of confeſſion is the building of the Church, which M. Sand. would auoyde by bringing in of two rocks, Chriſt & Peter: the particle excluſiue ſhutteth him cleane out of the dores, for Hillarie ſayth not, that Chriſte is a Rocke, but that he is the onely Rocke. Therefore this is but one Rocke and one building, and not as M. Sand ſayth two Rocks and two buildings, for aſwell hee might ſay two Churches. Now where Hilarie vpon Mathew acknowledgeth Peter to be a rock and foundation of the Church, it is anſweared before, that he was one of the xii. foundations ſpoken of Apoc. 21. in a farre other meaning then Chriſt is the onely Rock.

The 3. authoritie is, Cyrillus Dial, 4 de trini. The rock is nothing elſe, but the ſtrong & aſſured faith of the diſciple. This ſaith M. S. is that I would haue, for this diſciple was S. Peter, and the rock here ſpoken of is nothing elſe, but S. Peters faith, therfore it is not Chriſt. Nay rather the rock is nothing but S. Peters faith, therfore it is not his perſon & ſo no mortall man. For thoſe woordes, nothing but Peters faith, do not exclude Chriſt becauſe faith cannot be without neceſſary relation vnto Chriſt, but they exclude the perſon of Peter as a mortall man, becauſe fleſh & blood reuealed not this confeſſion vnto him, but the Heauenly father.

The 4. authorite is Chryſoſtome. Vpon this Rocke, that is, vpon this faith and this confeſſion I will builde my church. M. San. ſaith, he that beleeued & confeſſed was Peter and not Chriſt, ergo the rock is Peter & not Chriſt. Although this argument haue no conſequence in the world, yet to admitte that it doth followe, I will reply thus, but he that beleeued and confeſſed was not Peter onely, therefore Peter onely was not this rock.

The 5. is Aug. de verbis dom. Chriſte was the rocke vpon which foundation Peter him ſelfe was alſo builte. M. San. asketh if one Rock may not be built vpon another,

nother, as Peter vpon Christ? yes verily, but Peter none otherwise then the reste of the Apostles, who were all foundation stones, laid vpon the great corner stone or onely foundation Rock Iesus Christ.

S. Augustine againe addeth in Christes person. I wil not builde my selfe vpon thee, but I wil build thee vpon me. M San. following the allegory of building cõfesseth that Christ is the first & greatest stone, vpon which by all proportion, the seconde stone that should be laide, must be greatest that can be gotten next the first. If this be so, it is meruaile the Angel which shewed vnto Iohn the building of the heauenly Ierusalem, shewed him not this second stone by it selfe, but the xij. stones lying equally one by an other vppon the maine foundation. Apo. 21. whereby we see that M. Sand. vttereth nothing but the visions of his owne head.

The 6. is Origines in 4. sentence in 16. Mat. He is ỹ rock whosoeuer is the disciple of Christ. M. S. reciteth this sẽse as not literal, & seing Peter is a disciple, & the first, he wil proue Peter next to christ, to be ỹ chief rock. In deed according to this sense it must needes be, that Peter is one principall rock, among so many thousand rocks, but because he is named first in the Catalogue of the Apostles, it is a sory reason to make him so to excel, that he is one rock that beareth al the rest. But M. Iewel is frantike in M. San opinion, that denying any mortall man to be this rock, nowe proueth euery mortall man that is Christs disciple to be this Rock. Nay rather M. Sand. is brainsick, that cannot vnderstand this reason, euery Christian is such a rock as Peter was, therefore Peter in being a rock was not made Pope or hed of the vniuersal church. Origines procedeth, vpon such a rock all ecclesiasticall learning is built. *But S. Peter is such a Rock, (saith Maister Sander) ergo vppon him all ecclesiasticall learning is built. VVho would wish such an aduersary as M. Iewel is, who proueth altogither against him selfe?* Nay who can beare such an impudent caueler that findeth a knot in a rush; For your conclusion is graunted (M. Sand. that all eccle-

fiasticall learning is builte vppon S. Peter, but so it is builte vpon euery true Disciple of Christe by Origens iudgement.

« Againe Origine sayth: If thou thinke that the whole « Church is built onely vpon Peter, what then wilte thou « say of Iohn the sonne of thonder, and of euery of the « Apostles? First M.Sand.chargeth the Bishop for leauing out in English this worde *Illum*, so that he shoulde haue saide, vpon that Peter, whereby he accuseth him to deny, that Peter is a Rock, whiche is an impudente lye. Secondly when this authoritie doth vtterly ouerthrowe his whole building of the popish rocke, he can say nothing, but that Iohn was a mortall man, and so were all the Apostles aswel as Peter, therfore M.Iewel saide not truely, that the olde fathers haue written, not any mortall man, but Christe himselfe to be this Rock, when Iohn and all the Apostles be rockes. As though there were no difference betwene the onely foundation and rocke of the whole Church, which is Christ, & all the other stones that are built vpon it.

« Last of all Origen sayth: Shall we dare to say, that the « gates of hell shall not preuayle onely against Peter? or « are the keyes of the kingdom of heauen giuen onely to « Peter? M.Sander aunswereth, *It is enough that the gates of hell shall least of all preuayle against Peter, he hath chiefly the keyes of heauen.* But what reason hath he for this impudent assertion? Peter of all the Apostles first confessed in the name of the whole Church. Admit this were true, as it can neuer be proued, that this was the first time that any of the Apostles confessed Christ: yet no primacy of superiority is hereby gayned. if the sentence as Origen expounded it, perteyneth to euery faithfull disciple: What aduauntage M. Sander hath taken of the Bishops allegations, let the readers iudge.

The eight chapter.

Sander. *THe conclusion of the former discourse, and the order of the other which followeth.*

The

THe conclusion consisteth of 7. poynctes. In the first he repeateth what he woulde haue men thinke, he hath gained in his former discourse concerning Peter to be the Rock of the Church whereon it is builte. Fulke.

In the second for continuaunce of the building promised, there must be alwayes some mortall man, which beeing made the same Rocke by election, and afterwarde by reuelation, shoulde make the same confession, whensoeuer hee is demaunded, or consulted in matters of Religion. If this were true there were no necessitie of the holy Scriptures, neither yet of Synodes and Councelles, if one Pope were able to resolue all the demaundes mooued by all menne of the worlde.

In the thirde he sayeth, if there muste be some such one Rocke, it is not possible it shoulde be any other but the Bishop of Rome: First, because he alone hath beene the firste and chiefe in all assemblyes. Secondly, he only sitteth in Peters Chaire. Thirdly, and the consent of the world hath taken him so, euer indeede, but by the aduersaryes confession aboue a thousande yeeres. But God be thanked, the Churche hath no neede of any such Rock, neither is any such taught. Ephe. the fourth, where the order of the building thereof, and of all necessary builders of Fayth and doctrine are fully sette foorth. And the three reasons are all false, in manner and forme as they are vniuersally set downe, as in their proper places shalbe shewed.

In the the fourth he gloryeth, that he hath chosen to proue that poynte which of all other is moste hard. *That all the Apostles were not the same thinge that Peter was.* And firste he will aske in what Gospell or holye Scripture it is written, that euery other Apostle was the same Rocke, which Sainct Mathewe testifyeth Sainct Peter to haue beene. I answeare, not onely by necessary collection out of many places of Scripture, whiche he him selfe acknowledgeth to be the literall sense, as well as that which followeth the founde of wordes, it is

proued, but also in plaine wordes of Sainct Paul Ephe. the second, verse. 20. Where the Churche is builded vpon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophetes, Iesus Christ beeing the head corner stone. And Apo. 21 verse. 14. Where the twelue precious stones, the foundations of the wall of the Cittie, had on them the names of the xij. Apostles of the Lambe.

The 5. is either thus or nothing at all, for it is not noted in him as the other bee. If Cyprian or Hierome were alleadged for this equallitie, it were sufficient for him to say, they were no Euangelists. For he sheweth it written: thou shalt be called Cephas and thou art Peter. You see these men that bragge of the Doctors, will be holden by them, as long as they liste.

The 6. whereas all holy Scriptures is on the popish Catholicks side, he lamenteth the vnhappines of these dayes, in ẅ men altogither vnlearned in them, by the bare naming of Gods word, haue among Pedlers won their spurres, and amonge the ignoraunt haue gotten the opinion of knowledge. As truely as none but Pedles and ignoraunt men imbrace this doctrine which we teach, so truely all Scriptures be on M. Sand. side. Among so many Princes, noble men, and excellent learned men as at this day acknowledge this doctrine to be the trueth: M. Sanders head was very sleepy, when he could see none, but Pedlers and ignoraunt persons.

The seuenth he will take vpon him to shew, by what meanes Sainct Peter excelled the other Apostles, and sheweth in what order he will proceede, which seeing it is contained worde for worde in the titles of the seuen Chapters next following, I though it needelesse heere to rehearse.

The ninthe Chapter.

Sander. *THat Saincte Peter passeth farre the other Apostles in some kinde of ecclesiasticall dignitie.*

That

THat S. Peter had some excellent giftes, peraduenture more then some of the Apostles, that he had greate dignity among the Apostles, may easely be graũted, but that he had auctority ouer them, such as the Pope claymeth ouer all Bishops, is of vs vtterly denyed.

Neitherd oeth any one, nor all together, of M. Sãders 34. argumentes, proue that he had one iote of auctority ouer his brethren.

1 He was first in order of nombring of the twelue Apostles.

2 He was promised to be called Cephas, before the twelue were chosen.

3. He was named Peter at the time of the choise, ergo he hadde the Popes auctoritie ouer them. Who would graunt the consequence of these arguments? Let vs see what the other be.

4 It was sayd to him alone, *thou art Peter, & vppon this rocke I will build my Church.* I deny that it was said to him alone, for all the Apostles were likewise rockes, vppon which he would build his Church. The like I say of the 5. that the keyes of the kingdome of heauen were promised to him alone, for euery one of the Apostles receiued thẽ aswel as he, being ordained with equal power of binding & losing, of remit ing & retayning sinnes. *Mat.* 18. 18, *Ioan.* 20. 23. Notwithstanding the wordes at one time were spoken to Peter alone, yet did they giue him no singular auctority.

The 6 Christ payed tribute for Peter, as vnderhead of his family. ergo he was greater then the rest, A fond argument. This *Didrachma* was payd for euery man in the City where he dwelt, & because Peter had a house and a family in the Cytie, Christ payed for him with whom he lodged, and him selfe. But if you drawe it into an allegorie. These absurdities will follow.

First, that Christ maketh his Church and spirituall kingedome subiect to tribute, yea, to Moses lawe, by which that kind of tribute was due.

Secondly you deuide Christes church into two householdes, Didrachma was to be payde, for the heade or firste borne of euery house. And you shewe your ignoraunce in referring this payment to Num.3. which was only for the firste borne, wheras this was for all men. And for the firste borne was dewe fiue siccles, whereof euery one was halfe an Vnce of Siluer at the leaste, whereas Didrachma contayning but two Drachmaes. whereof euery one was equall with the Romane pennie coulde be but xvj. pence at the moste of our monie.

It is a strong argument, that the payment of trybute which argueth subiection, should make Peter so greate a Lorde, that he should be out of all subiection, which if Chrysostome had considered, hee woulde not haue grounded Peters primacie vppon so friuolus an Argument.

The seuenth, Christe preached out of Saincte Peters Bote, to shew that in his Chaire, his doctrine should alwayes be stedfastly professed. An Argument to be answeared either with laughing or hissing.

The 8. *Though all the Apostles were to be sifted, yet Peters Fayth alone is prayed for.* This is vtterly false, for Christe prayed for all his Apostles fayth. Ioh.17. if specially for Peter, it was in respecte of his greater daunger, and not in respect of his greater dignitie.

The 9. *Peter firste entred into the Sepulchre, ergo he was made pope.* He entred for farther confirmation of his Fayth concerning Christes resurrection, this maye be imputed to diligence but not to dignitie.

10, The Angell sayth, Tel his Disciples and Peter, naming him seuerally because of his shamefull fall, he had more neede of comforte.

The 11. *Ambrose thinketh Peter was the firste man that saw him.* Nay rather the Souldiors which kept the graue saw him before Peter, & the women also, which would geue them dignity aboue Peter, if firste seeing were a matter to argue dignity.or auctority of the seer.

The

The 12. *onely S. Peter walked on the Sea, that signifieth the worlde to be his iurisdiction.* As he walked by Fayth, so by weakenesse of fayth he beganne to sinke. And the Sea that he walked on, was but a lake or meere, & therfore cannot well signifie the whole worlde, beside, the argument is as sure as if it were bound with a strawe.

13 *S. Peter is shewed to haue loued Christe more then the reste, and is alone commaunded to feede his sheepe.* He had good cause to loue him more, because greater sinnes were forgiuen him, but it is false, that he onely was commaunded to feed Christes sheepe, for all the Apostles were likewise commaunded.

14 *It is saide to Peter, thou shalte stretch foorth thy hands and followe thou mee, by which a particular kinde of death on the crosse is prophecied.* A violent death, but no particular kinde of death is shewed by these wordes. And although it were, yet Peter in beeing Crucifyed, was made no greater then Andrewe, who was crucifyed also, if the storyes of both be true,

15 *Peter aunsweared alwayes for the Apostles, ergo hee was chiefe.* No more then the foreman of the Iewrye, although it is not true, that he alwayes aunsweared for the rest, for sometime Thomas, sometime Philip, sometime Iudas aunsweared. Iohn. 14.

16 *Peter pronounced, Iudas Iscariot deposed.* That was by speciall instinct of the holy Ghoste, and by no ordinary authoritie.

17 After the sending of the holy Ghost, Peter aboue all the rest, firste taught the fayth. Chrysostome and Cyrill sayth, he did it by th econsent of all the rest, who all stoode vp togither with him, although one spake to auoyde confusion, when the Apologie was made to answere the slaunderous scoffers. But before that, they taught euery one a like.

18 *The multitude conuerted, said to Peter and to the other Apostles, but to Peter by name: VVhat shall we doe.* If this proue any thing, it proueth the equallitie of the Apostles, that hauing heard one man preach they demand

not of him alone, but of all the reſt with him, what they ſhall doe?

19 *Peter made aunſwere for all, that they ſhould repent & be baptiſed.* It was good reaſon ſeeing he made the apologie for all.

20 *Peter did the firſt miracle after the comming of the holy Ghoſt and by healing the lames feete ſhewed myſtically, that he was the rocke to eſtabliſhe the feete of other.* I aunſwere, Iohn healed him as muche as Peter, by Peters owne confeſſion *Act.*3.12.and the lame mans acknowledging the benefit to be receiued equally from both, in holding Peter and Iohn.

21 *Peter cõfeſſed Chriſt firſt not only before priuate mẽ, but at the ſeate of iudgement. Act.*4. It is falſe that Peter cõfeſſed Chriſt firſt before priuate men, and at the ſeate of iudgement, he confeſſeth equally with Ihon.

22 *Peter alone gaue ſentence with fullneſſe of power vpon Ananias and Saphyra.* Not by ordinarie power, but by ſpeciall reuelation, and direction of the holie Ghoſt, whatſoeuer Gregorie a partiall iudge in this caſe doth gather.

23 *Peter was ſo famous aboue the reſt, that his ſhadow was ſought, to heale the diſeaſed.* This was a ſingular and perſonall gift, which the Pope hath not, therefore it perteineth nothing to him.

24 *Peter did excommunicate & enioyne penance to Symon Magus the firſt heretike.* Peter denounced Gods iudgement againſt him, but not by way of excõmunication, & yet the argumẽt is naught, as all the reſt are, though the antecedents were graunted.

25 *Peter was the firſt that raiſed a deade body to life, namely Tabitha after Chriſts aſcẽtiõ.* This is neither proued to be true, neither if it were, ſhould Peter thereby haue greater auctoritie, then his fellow Apoſtles which likewiſe raiſed the dead and peraduenture before Peter, although S. Luke make no mention of them.

26 *Peter had firſt by viſion that the Gentiles were called to beleue in Chriſt.* This is falſe, for Paule had that in viſion before

before him. *Act.9.& 26.17.*

27 *God chose that the Gentiles shoulde first of all heare the worde of the Gospell by Peters mouth, and shoulde beleeue. Actes.* 15. This is false, for Peter sayeth not, first of all, but of olde tyme. And the Eunuche of Æthiopia, was baptised by Philippe before Cornelius of Peter.

28 *Prayer was made for Peter, by the churche, which was not so earnestly made for any other Apostle that we read of.* Their earnest prayer for Peter, is set forth to shewe that God at their prayer deliuered Peter, not that Peter was thereby shewed to be greater in auctoritie.

29 *Paule and Barnabas came to Ierusalem to the Apostles to fetch a solution from Peter. Act.* 15. as Theodoret noteth. But S. Luke noteth, that they came to all the Apostles and Elders at Ierusalem, and not to Peter onely, nor for his solution, but for the solution of the councell.

30 *In the councell Act.*15. *Peter did not onely speake first but also gaue the determinate sentence.* Both the partes of this proposition are false, for Sainct Luke testifieth, there was greate disputation before Saincte Peter spake, also Sayncte Iames as President of the councell, gaue the definitiue sentence, accordinge to whose wordes, the synodicall Epistle, was written in the name of all the Apostles and Elders at Ierusalem.

31 *Sainct Paule came to Ierusalem to see Peter as Chrysostome sayeth because he was primus first or chiefe?* But Sainct Paule him selfe affirmeth in the same place, and diuerse other, that he was equall with Peter, and the highest Apostles. *Galathians* 2.8. *2.Corinthians* 12.11.

32 *Peter was either alone or first & chiefest in the greatest affaires of the church.* The greatest affaire of the church was the preaching vnto the Gentils in which Peter was neither alone, nor first, nor chiefest. But Paule chiefest. *Gal.*2.

33 *Peter was sent to Rome to occupie with his chaire the mother church of the Romane prouince and chiefe citie of the worlde, and there vanquished Symon Magus the head of heretikes.* &c. All this is vncerteyne being not founde in the Scriptures, but those stories which reporte it, conuinced by Scriptures, to be false in diuerse circumstaunces.

34 *Peters chaire and succession hath bene acknowledged of all auncient fathers &c.* Although the see of Rome appoynted for the seate of Antechrist, hath of olde bene verie ambitious, yet it is a fable, that hath bene acknowledged by all auncient fathers to haue the auctoritie, which the Bishoppes thereof, haue claymed. For Irenæus rebuked Victor, for vsurping. All the Bishops of Africa in councel, withstoode Innocentius, Zozimus, Bonifacius, and Cæbastinus, alleaging for their auctoritie a counterfaite decree of the councell of Nice, as we haue shewed before in the first treatise, the like may be sayed of the councells of Chalcedon, of Constantinople, the 5. &c. which withstoode the Bishoppe of Romes auctoritie in such cases as he pretended prerogatiue.

To cõclude, neither any one, nor altogether of these 34. reasons, proue Peter to be greater in auctority, then the rest of the Apostles, and much lesse the Bishoppe of Rome to be greater then Bishops of other seates.

The tenth Chapter.

Sander. *THat the Apostles beside the prerogatiue of their Apostleshippe, had also the auctoritie to be particular Bishoppes, which thing their name also did signifie in the olde time.*

Fulke. ALthough the Apostles had all such auctoritie, as euerie particular Bishop hath, yet had they not two offices, but one Apostleship. No more then a King although he haue all auctoritie that euerie Constable hath,

hath, is thereby both a King and a Constable, but a King onely. Neither doth their staying, or as he calleth it residence, in some particular citie, proue that the Apostles either were or might be Bishops, that is geue ouer their generally charge and take vpon them a particular, or still reteyning their generall charge, to exercise the office of a Bishoppe any longer, then vntill the churche was perfectly gathered, where they remayned. For although the holy Ghost distinguished their vniuersall charge into seuerall partes, to auoyde confusion, as in making Peter chiefe Apostle of the circumcision, and Paule of the Gentiles, yet were they not thereby made Bishoppes. And although the consent of writers is, that Iames was Bishoppe of Ierusalem, yet following the course of the Scriptures, we must hold that Iames by decree of the holy Ghost, was appoynted to stay there, not as a Bishoppe, but as an Apostle for the conuersion of the Iewes, which not onely out of all Iurie, but out of all partes of the world, came thither ordinarily to worshippe. Of S. Peters sitting at Antioch as Bishoppe, we finde nothing in the Scriptures, and lesse of his remouing to Rome. But we finde that when Peter came to Antioche, Paule withstoode him to his face, and reproued him openly, which he might not well haue done, if Peter had bene supreame heade of the church, & in his owne see as M. Sander doth fantasie.

Where he alleageth the text *& Episcopatum eius accipiat alter*, and let an other take his Bishoprike, to proue that Iudas and so the Apostles were Bishoppes, it is too childish & fonde an argument, seeing the Greeke word, which S. Luke vseth & the Hebrue word which the Prophet vseth, signifieth generally a charge or office, and not suche a particular office of a Bishoppe, as nowe we speake of.

He citeth farther Theodorete *in* 3. *cap.* 1. *ad Tim.* to proue y the name of an Apostle in the primitiue church did signifie such a Bishoppe. But howe greatly Theodoret was deceaued, appeareth by this, that he citeth for

proofe *Philip.* 2. Epaphroditus to be the Apoſtle of the Philippenſians, becauſe S. Paule ſayth of him Epaphroditus your Apoſtle, and my helper: whereas he meaneth that he was their meſſenger, vſing the worde ἀπόστολος in the generall ſignification for a meſſenger, and not for the name of ſuche an officer as an Apoſtle or Biſhoppe. He nameth alſo Titus and Timotheus which in the Scripture, are neuer called Apoſtles, likewiſe the Apoſtles and Elders at Ieruſalem, which were in deede the true Apoſtles of Chriſts immediat ſending, and not Biſhoppes ordeyned by men. And whereas Hierome ſayeth, *that all Biſhoppes be ſucceſſors of the Apoſtles*, he meaneth manifeſtly in auctoritie, within their ſeuerall charges, and not that the Apoſtles were Biſhops. Likewiſe where Auguſtine ſayth, *that the Biſhoppes were made in ſteede of the Apoſtles*, it rather proueth that the Apoſtles, were no Biſhoppes, for then if the Apoſtles were Biſhoppes, he ſhould ſay, Biſhoppes were made in ſteede of Biſhoppes.

The laſt reaſon is, that if the office of Biſhoppes had not bene diſtinct in the Apoſtles, frō their Apoſtleſhip, that office woulde haue ceaſed with the Apoſtleſhippe, for the whole being taken away no parte can remayne, except it had an other grounde to ſtande in, beſide the Apoſtleſhippe, as the Biſhoppely power had. In deede if the Apoſtleſhippe had ceaſed before Biſhoppes had bene ordeyned, Biſhoplike power woulde haue ceaſed with it: but ſeeing the Apoſtles ordeyned Biſhops and Elders in euery congregation, to continue to the worlds ende, the Biſhoppes office hath not ceaſed, though the office of the Apoſtles is expired. Wherefore ſeeing neither by Scripture, reaſon, nor Doctors, this diſtinction of offices in the Apoſtles, can be proued, when Peter is called heade, Prince, chiefe, firſt, Capteyne of the Apoſtles by Cyrill, or any auncient writer, we muſt vnderſtande, as Ambroſe teacheth a primacie of confeſſion or fayth, not of honor or degree *de incar. dom cap.* 4.

The

The 11. chapter.

HOw farre S. Peter did ether excell or was equall with the Apoſtles in their Apoſtolike office. VVherein diuerſe obiections are aunſwered, which ſeeme to make againſt S. Peters ſupremacie. Sander.

BVt that neceſſity enforceth him, M. Sander thinketh it ſinne of curioſitie to inquire of that equality or inequalitie of the Apoſtles, *whereas it ſhould ſuffice vs to follow the preſent ſtate of the vniuerſall Church practiſed in our time.* As though the vniuerſall Church of any time, did euer acknowledge the Pope to be ſupreame heade, although a great part of the world hath of long time ſo taken him. He thinketh it out of controuerſie, that S. Peter was the firſt of the Apoſtles as S. Mathew ſayth, *primus*, the firſt, Simon which is called Peter. And he is not cõtent that he was firſt in the order of numbring, but he will haue him firſt in dignitie, becauſe he is alwayes named firſt. But that is nether true, nor a good reaſon if it were true, becauſe he is named firſt, therefore he is of greateſt dignitie. But *Gal.* 2. 9 Iames and Cephas & Iohn are ſayde to haue bene pillers of the Churche, and yet Paule equall with them. Although if we graunted greateſt dignity to Peter, yet thereupon did not follow greateſt authority. For theſe three Apoſtles laſt named, were of greateſt dignity among the Apoſtles, yet not of greater authoritie then the reſt. And although the auncient fathers of the worde *primus*, haue deriued the name of *primatus*, or primacy, yet haue they alſo expreſſed, wherin this primacie doth conſiſt, namely not in authoritie but in order, nether doth thoſe names Prince, chiefe, heade, toppe, guide, mouth, greateſt of the Apoſtles, vſed by ſome of them, ſignifie his authoritie ouer them, but his dignitie amongeſt them. Fulke.

But if you aſke him wherin Peter was chiefe? He anſwereth ỳ queſtion is curious. For in ỳ nature & order of

the apoſtleſhip, euery Apoſtle was equall with all his fellowes,& ſo is euery Biſhop Prieſt,King,Duke, Knight with euery one of his degree.If this be as he ſayth,then was Peter chiefe,nether as Apoſtle nor Biſhoppe. But there may be another thinge (ſayth he) coincident to ſome degree of men,not neceſſary for the being,but for their well being. One therefore was ſet ouer the Apoſtles,for vnities ſake,and to auoyd ſchiſmes as Cyprian & Hierom write in places before cited. This muſt nedes be a primacy of order and not of authoritie,for amonge men of equall authoritie, as he confeſſeth the Apoſtles were, one may be choſen as the Preſident or Primate, to auoyd confuſion, the auſteritie remayning equall to euery one,but one can not be preferred in authoritie to remayne ſtill equall with his fellowes in auctoritie.

But wheras Optatus lib.2 *de ſchiſm. Don. & Leo ad Anaſtaſ. Ep.*82. are cited to proue that the ſame primacie which Peter ſome time (but yet not alwaies)had among the Apoſtles, ſhould be reteyned in ſucceſſion of his chayre to mayntayne vnitie amonge all men, it hath no ground in the holy Scriptures, and yet thoſe good men were farre from imagining ſuche an abſolute power of Peters ſucceſſor, as M. Sander defendeth in the Pope, although ſome times he doe handle it ſo nicely, as it might ſeeme to be a thing of nothing,wherein the Pope is aboue his fellow Biſhops,where I ſayd,that Peter had not alwayes the primacie of order among the Apoſtles, it is proued,both by the 15. of the Actes, where Iames was Preſident of the councell,& Gal.2.not onely where Iames is named before Peter, but alſo where Peter abſtayned and ſeparated him ſelfe, after certayne came from Iames,fearing them of the circumciſion, leſt he ſhould haue bene euill thought of, as he was before for keeping company with Cornelius. and in diuerſe other places of the Actes of the Apoſtles.

But M.Sander will adde another truth,to the former doctrine of Peters primacie, namely that ſeeing the Apoſtles needed no heade,becauſe they were not in daũger

ger of error, the head was appoynted ouer them for an example of the Church afterward, when that personall priuiledge of the Apostles ceased to be in their successors. But how wil he proue that the priuiledge of not erring, hath continued in Peters successors, more then in the successors of all the Apostles. Forsooth because Christ prayed that Peters faith might not fayle, that he might confirme his brethren. I haue often shewed that he prayed for the perseuerance of all his Apostles, and the cause of his speciall prayer for Peter, was proper to Peters person, therefore can not be drawne to his successors. And what madnes is it, to defend that the Pope can not erre? when Pope Honorius was condemned for an heretike both by the 6. Councell of Constantinople, and by the decree of Leo 2. Bishop of Rome confirming the same councell. *Act.* 18. *Ep. Leon.* 2. *ad Constant.*

But M. Sander concludeth, to aunswer the argument of the equalitie of the Apostles, that Paule was equall with Peter in Apostleship: but by the appoyntment and will of Christ, Peter was heade, to shew that his Church hauing one Pastor in it aboue the rest, is one, as a kingdom one, by hauing one king in it. Howbeit we finde the will of God for the supremacie and headship of Christ, ouer all his Church, to make it one, in the holy Scriptures, when of Peters headship or supremacie there is neuer a word. And Paule sayth, that he was nothing inferiour to the highest Apostles, 2. *Cor.* 2. if nothing absolutely, then was not Peter his superiour in any respect.

That Paule reprehended Peter, M. Sander sayth, he might doe it by equalitie of his Apostleship. If that be so, why may not euery Bishop reprehende the Pope by equality of Bishoprike. If you graunt they may, then haue you so many Canones against you, as you can neuer saue their authoritie and abide by your confession. But this fault you say, with Tertullian, was of conuersation, not of preaching, that Peter might not seeme to haue erred in doctrine. Neuertheles it can not be excused, but Peter also erred in doctrine. Not in the generall do-

ctrine of the abolishing of the lawe, or of Christian libertie, but of bearing too much with the Iewes, in preiudice of the Gentils, whom he compelled to Iudaisme, & in derogation of the truth of Paules doctrine, which dissimulation he entred not into, for any worldely respect, but becausse he was deceyued in opinion, thinking that in that case he ought so to haue done, before he being reprehended by Paule, sawe the inconuenience, and then myldely yelded to the correction. But in this humble submission sayth Maister Sanders, Peter proued him selfe to be the head of all the Apostles, seeing Christ had sayde, he that is greater among you let him be as the lesser. In deede he shewed herein such greatnes, as Christ commendeth, but no headeship or authoritie ouer his brethren. *Cyprian ad Quintum*, sayth he, did not iudge this reprouing of Peter, to be an argument against his supremacie, but a witnes of his humilitie, but he giueth vs this much to vnderstande, that if he had chalenged primacie, he had taken vpon him arrogantly, his wordes are these.

" *Nam nec Petrus quem primum Dominus elegit, &c.* For
" nether did Peter, whome our Lorde chose the first, and
" vpon whome he builded his Church, when Paule did
" striue with him about circumcision afterward, chalenge
" any thinge insolently, or take vpon him arrogantly, to
" say that he had the primacie, and that he ought rather
" to haue bene obeyed of Nouices and aftercommers: ne-
" ther did he despise Paule, for that he was before a per-
" secutor of the Churche, but he did admitte the coun-
sell of truth. The like sayth Augustine for his humilitie, but as a later writer more pregnant for his primacye. *De bap. cont. Don. lib. 2. cap. 1. In Scripturis &c. We haue learned in the holy Scriptures, that Peter the Apostle, in whome the primacie of the Apostles in so excellent grace hath the preheminence, when he vsed to doe otherwise then the truth required about circumcision, was corrected of Paule who was admitted after him to be an Apostle.* In this saying the primacye is of tyme and order, not of dignitie

nitie and authoritie. But Gregory much later then Auguſtine, graunteth to Peter, not onely a primacie, but alſo a maioritie, *in Ezech. Hom.* 18. *Quatenus, &c. That he who was chiefe in the toppe of the Apoſtleſhip, ſhould be chiefe alſo in humilitie.* And agayne, *Ecce à minore, &c. Beholde Peter is reproued of his leſſer, and he diſdayneth not to be reproued. Nether doth he call to minde, that he firſt was called to the Apoſtleſhip.* Theſe wordes make Peter greater none otherwiſe, then that he was firſt called to the Apoſtleſhip, which argueth ſmall authoritie ouer his iuniours.

Hereupon he taketh occaſion to inueye againſt the pride of Luther, Zwinglius, Caluine &c. and their bitter diſſentions, ſhewing how farre they are vnlike to the Apoſtles. It is not to be doubted, that they were many degrees inferior to the vertue and holines of the Apoſtles, but yet as well in humilitie as all other vertues, if they come not nearer to them, then the Pope, and his pompous Clergye, let God and all indifferent men bee Iudges.

Moreouer where as it is obiected againſt the ſupremacie of Peter, that the Apoſtles ſent him to lay hands vpon thoſe whom Philip the Deacon had baptized: he aunſwereth, that proueth no more their equalitie, then when the Canones of a Cathedrall Church doe choſe their Deane or Biſhop, to go about buſines of the chapter, it proueth the Deane and Biſhop to be inferior to the Canõs. But by his fauor, where the Deane or Biſhop are ſent about buſines, it argueth the Biſhop and Deane in reſpect of thoſe buſines, to be inferior to the whole chapiter, as Peter & Iohn were to the whole Colledge of the Apoſtles, though the Biſhop or Deane in other reſpects, be ſuperior to the Canons, and Peter and Iohn were equall to euery one of the Apoſtles.

Wherfore M. Sanders concluſion is vpon a falſe ſuppoſition, that Peter had authoritie to depoſe the Apoſtles, if they had fallen as Iudas did, therefore the Pope hath the like ouer Biſhops. For nether had Peter any

singular auctoritie to depose any of his fellow Apostles, no more then he had to chose one in place of Mathias, nor the Bishop of Rome ouer other Bishops euer had of right, but by concession, election, or vsurpation.

The 12. chapter.

Sander. *That S. Peters prerogatiue aboue the other Apostles, is most manifestly seene by his chiefe Bishoply power. Howe Christ loued Peter aboue others.*

Fulke. M. Sander fantasying that he hath proued Peter superior to the Apostles, not in their Apostleship, but in his Byshoply degree, doth yet againe distinguish the order and office of a Byshop from the authoritie and iurisdiction of the same. And in order and office he confesseth that all Byshopps of the worlde, are equall as Hierome sayeth, *ad Euagrium*, and Cyprian *De vnitate ecclesiæ*, but not in authoritie. But seeing he rehearseth the testimonie of Hierome imperfectly, I will set it downe at large, that you may see whether it will beare his distinction. He writeth against a custome of the Church of Rome, by which the Deacons were preferred aboue the Priestes, whome hee proueth by the Scripture to be equall with Byshoppes, excepte « onely in ordaining. *Quid enim facit exempta ordinatione « Episcopus &c.* For what doth a Bishop excepting ordina- « tion which a Priest or Elder doth not? Neither is it to « be thought, that there is one church of the city of Rome « and an other of the whole worlde. Both Fraunce, and « Britayn, & Africa, and Persia, and the East, and India, & « all barbarous nations, worship one Christ, obserue one « rule of truth. If auctoritie be sought, the world is greater « then a citie. Whereseoeuer a Bishop be either at Rome, « or at Eugubium, or at Constantinople, or at Rhegium, « or at Alexandria, or at Tunis, he is of the same worthi- « nes & of the same Priesthoode. Power of riches & base- « nes of pouerty, make not the Bishop higher or inferior.

But

but they are all ſucceſſors of the Apoſtles. And leſt you ſhould thinke he ſpeaketh onely of equalitie in order & office, & not in authority. He doth in an other place ſhew that the authoritie of euery Prieſt is equall with euery Biſhop by Gods diſpoſition, & that the excelling of one Biſhop aboue other Prieſts, came only by cuſtom. *In Titum cap. 1. Sicut ergo preſbyteri ſciunt ſe ex Eccleſiæ conſuetudine, ei qui ſibi præpoſitus fuerit, eſſe ſubiectos: ita Epiſcopi nouerint, ſe magis conſuetudine, quam diſpoſitionis Dominicæ veritate, preſbyteris eſſe maiores.* Therefore as Prieſtes do know, that by cuſtom of the Church, they are ſubiect to him that is ſet ouer them: ſo let Biſhops know, that they are greater then Prieſts, rather by cuſtom then by truth of the Lordes appoyntment. If the authoritie then & iuriſdiction of Biſhops dependeth vpon cuſtō, & not vpon gods appointment, Peter was not by our lords appointmēt preferred in biſhoplik authority before the reſt of ỹ Apoſtles, nor the Biſhop of Rome, before other Biſhops & Prieſtes, but only by cuſtom. as Hierom ſaith. S. Cyprians wordes alſo inferre the ſame. *Epiſcopatus vnus eſt, cuius à ſingulis in ſolidum pars tenetur.* The Biſhops office is one, whereof euery man doth partake the Biſhops office wholy. Now if authoritie & iuriſdiction doe pertayne to the Biſhops office, euery Biſhop hath it wholy, as (to follow M. Sanders example) whatſoeuer is incident to the nature or kind of a man, is equally in euery man.

But now the greateſt matter reſteth, to proue how S. Peter had more committed to his charge then the reſt of the Apoſtles, and that he taketh on him to proue, by this reaſon. Peter loued Chriſt more then all the reſt of the Apoſtles, therefore he gaue him greater authoritie in feeding his ſheepe, then to the reſt, But I deny the argument. For Peter loued Chriſt more then the reſt, becauſe Chriſt had forgiuen him greater ſinnes, then to the reſt, *Luc.* 7. 47. In conſideration whereof, he required greater diligence in doing his office, but gaue him not a greater charge or authoritie.

Now where M. Sander reaſoneth, that Peter loued

Christ most, becauſe Christ first loued him most, and Christ loued him most, becauſe he would make him gouernour of his Church, it is a ſhamefull petition or begging of that which is in queſtion. For the neareſt cauſe of Peters greater loue, was the greater mercy which he founde, which mercy proceeding from the loue of God as the firſt & infinite cauſe, can haue no higher, ſuperior, or former cauſe. But Peter in reſpect of greater loue ſhewed to him, in that greater ſinne was forgiuen him, was bound to ſhewe greater loue toward Chriſt, which he required to be ſhewed in feeding his ſheepe, yet this proueth not, that greater authoritie was giuen him, or that he did feede more then all men. For S. Paule ſayth truly of himſelfe, I haue labored more then they all, 1. *Cor.* 15. 10. wherby it appeareth, that Peter as a man, was not equall with Chriſt in the effect of excellent loue, which was in him incomparable. And whereas M. Sander talketh ſo much of his commiſſion of feeding, I ſay theſe words *feede my ſheepe &c.* be not wordes of a newe commiſſion, but words of exhortation, that he ſhew exceeding diligence in the commiſſion equally deliuered to all the Apoſtles: As my father hath ſent me, ſo I ſend you. *Ioan.* 20. 21.

But the auncient fathers expound it ſo, that it might ſeeme to be a ſingular commiſſion to Peter. It can not be denyed but diuers of the auncient fathers, otherwiſe godly and learned, were deceyued in opinion of Peters prerogatiue, which appeareth not in the Scriptures, but was chalenged by the Biſhops of Rome, which ſeemed to haue a ſhew of ſome benefit of vnitye to the Church, ſo long as the Empire cõtinued at Rome, & the Biſhops of that citie retayned the ſubſtance of Catholike religion: yet did they neuer imagine, that ſuch blaſphemous & tyrannicall authoritie, yea ſuch falſe & hereticall doctrine, as afterward was mayntayned vnder the pretẽce of that prerogatiue, ſhoulde or ought to haue bene defended thereby. But let vs ſee what M. Sander can ſaye, out of the auncient writers. *Auguſt. in Hom. de paſt. cap.* 13. writeth:

writeth: *Dominus &c. Our Lord hath commended vnitie in Peter him selfe. There were many Apostles, and it is sayde to one, feede my sheepe. God forbid there should now lacke good pastors, but all good pastors are in one, they are one.* This maketh nothing for Peters authority ouer the rest, but only the author supposeth the vnitie of all Pastors to be allegorically signified, in that Christ speaketh that to one, which is common to all good sheepeheardes, namely to feede his sheepe. And againe *de sanct hom. 24 In vno Petro &c. The vnitie of all pastors was figured in one Peter.* So might it wel be without giuing Peter authoritie ouer all Pastors. Chrysostom is the next: *lib. 2. de sacerdotio,* who sayth that Christ did aske whether Peter loued him, not to teache vs ỳ Peter loued him, but to enforme vs *quanti sibi curæ sit gregis huius præfectura.* howe great care he taketh of the gouernment of this flock. Here he would haue vs marke, that Chrysostom calleth it a rule & gouernment of the flock, which Christ intendeth. Yea sir, we see it very wel, but you would make vs blind, if we could not see, that Chrysostom speaketh not of a generall rule, graunted to Peter only, but of the gouernment of euery Churche by euery Pastor. And therefore you daunce naked in a net, when you alledge the words following absolutely, as though they pertayned to Peter onely. *Petrum Christus auctoritate præditum esse voluit, &c.* wheras Chrysostom speaking to euery Priest, & shewing how careful he ought to be in his office, in respect of his high calling & the excellent dignitie thereof, sayth: *Etiam ne nunc nobiscum contendes fraudem istam tibi non bene ac fœliciter cessisse, qui per eam vniuersis Dei optimi maximi bonis administrandis sis præficiendus, quũ præsertim ea agas, quę cũ Petrus ageret, illũ Christus auctoritate prędituũ esse voluit, ac reliquos item Apostolos longè præcellere.* Wilt thou then stil contend with vs, that this fraude hath not happened well & luckely to thee, which by it, art to be made ouerseer of all the goods of God almightye, especially when thou doest those thinges, which when Peter did, Christ would haue him to be endued with authoritie, &

alſo farre to excel the other Apoſtles. Here M. Sander wil haue vs note 3. things, 1. Peters authoritie, 2. paſſing the Apoſtles, 3. farre paſſing. We marke them all, that they are directly ouerthrowing M. Sanders rocke of the popiſh Churche. For they declare, that Peter in doing thoſe things, was endued with authoritie, & farre paſſed the other Apoſtles, euen as euery Prieſt (to whō Chryſoſtom ſpeaketh) when he doth the ſame thinges, is endued with the ſame authoritie, & farre paſſeth all other men. So that here is none other authority, nor excellēce of Peter then ſuch as is common to all miniſters in executing their charge, and was common to all the Apoſtles when they did the ſame things that Peter did. For Chryſoſtom proueth to Baſil, that he did him no hurt, when by pollicie he cauſed him to be called to the miniſtery againſt his will, ſeeing that thereby he was made partaker of the reward of the faithfull & wiſe ſeruaunt, and equall in authoritie with Peter, if of loue towarder Chriſt he would diligently feede his flocke. So that Leo had no iuſt cauſe to ſaye that in reſpect of any greater authoritie, *Peter had a ſpeciall care of feeding the ſheepe committed to him.* but rather in reſpect that he had greater cauſe to loue Chriſt, which had ſo mercifully forgiuen him ſo ſhamefull a fall.

But Arnobius is a leſſe partiall witnes then Leo a Biſhop of Rome, & he vpon the Pſal. 138. writeth thus. *Nullus Apoſtolorum nomen &c. None of the Apoſtles receiued the name of a Paſtor. For our Lord Ieſus Chriſt alone ſaide. I am the good paſtor, & againe my ſheepe follow me. Therefore this holy name, & the power of this name, after his reſurrection he graunted to Peter repenting. And he that was thryſe denyed, gaue to his denyer, that power which he had alone.* Arnobius (ſaith he) noteth none of the Apoſtles euer to haue had the name of a paſtor giuen to him by Chriſt, beſide S. Peter alone. But I demaund of M. S. where he hath in Arnobius this word euer? For he ſayth, ỹ Peter had this name after ỹ reſurrection ẅ none of ỹ Apoſtles had before. He writeth againſt the Nouatians ẅ denied helpe

to

to such as repented after baptisme, prouing by exãple of Peter, that they are to be receyued, seeing Christ gaue him greater dignitie after his repentance, then he had before his fal. But that Peter had greater authoritie thẽ the rest of the Apostles he neuer thought or sayde. M. Sander cutteth of both the head and the tayle. In this discourse lest the meaning of Arnobius might appeare, for thus he writeth: *Dicis certè baptizatis non debere pœnitentibus subueniri. Ecce Apostolo pœnitenti succurritur, qui est Episcoporum Episcopus, & maior gradus addita pleranti, quam sublatus est deneganti. Quod vt doceam, illud offendo, quod nullius Apostolorũ nomen Pastoris accepit. &c.* In deede thou sayst that such as repent being baptised ought not to be helped. Beholde the Apostle repenting is helped, which is a Bishop of Bishops, and a greater degree is restored to him weeping, then was taken from him denying. Which that I may teach, this I shew, that none of the Apostles receyued the name of a sheepeheard, &c. Againe in the ende following the wordes before cited by M. Sander he sayth, *vt non solum recuperasse quod amiserat, probaretur, verum etiam & multo amplius pœnitendo, quam negando perdiderat acquisisse.* He gaue his denyer that power which before his resurrection he alone had: That he might be proued not onely to haue recouered that which he lost, but also to haue gotten much more by repenting, then he lost by denying. This speaketh Arnobius of the general authoritie which Peter had ouer all the Church, as euery Apostle had likewise, & was a Bishop and ouerseer of Bishops as well as Peter, and a Pastor of the vniuersal Church, which thing Arnobius neuer did deny. These therfore be M. Sanders arguments, none of the Apostles had the name of a Pastor before Christes resurrection, *ergo* they neuer had it. Peter was called to greater dignitie after his fall then he had before, *ergo* he was greater then his fellow Apostles. Again Peter was a Bishop or an ouerseer of Bishops, *ergo* he was Bishop ouer the Apostles.

Next Arnobius is cited Ambrose *in* 24. *Luc.* Who first

ayd, that *Peter was euery where, either alone or first.* And the vpon these words, *Peter doost thou loue me,* sayth: *Dominus interrogat &c. Our Lord asked not to learne, but to teach who he beeing to be lifted vpp into heauen, did leaue to vs as the Vicare of his loue. For so thou hast it. Simon thou sonne of Iohn, doest thou loue me? Yea Lord thou knowest that I loue thee. Iesus sayth to him, feede my Lambes. Peter beeing privy of a good conscience, doth testifie his owne affection, not taken for the time, but already well knowen to God. For who else were able to professe this thing of himselfe. And because he alone amongst all professeth, he is preferred before all.* M. Sander omitteth the conclusion. *Maior enim omnibus charitas.* For the greatest of all is Charitie.

So Peter is heereby declared to haue the greateste loue, but not to haue the greatest authoritie. M. Sander vrgeth that he is the Vicar of Christes loue and pastorall office. The one indeede Ambrose sayth, the other Sander sayeth but is not able to proue: no not by that which followeth in the same place of Ambrose, that *Peter had committed to him to feede, not onely the Lambes with milke, as at the first, nor yet the little sheepe, as at the seconde time, but the sheepe, to the end that he beeing more perfect, might gouerne the more perfecte.* For euery one of the Apostles hadde the same charge to feede the sheepe of Christe, and not the Lambes or little sheepe onely. Neither doth the woorde of gouernment helpe him. For euery Apostle had the like gouernment ouer the whole flock ẅ Peter hath, and there is an ordinary gouernment in euery particular church, 1. Co. 12. ẅ proueth not the gouernors to be rulers one ouer another, wherefore this collection is not only vaine, but also ridiculus, that Peter should haue authoritie to gouerne Patriarches, Archbishops and Bishops aswell as Parishe priests, beecause he must feed ỹ sheep of Christ, I wil not here stand to discus how properly ỹ distinctiō of lambs litle sheep & sheep, is obserued by Ambrose, but taking it according as he distinguisheth it, yet heere is nothing giuen to Peter but primacie of loue, or as elsewhere he

sayth

sayth of order, but of authoritie singular, heere is nothing at al. And that his conclusiō declareth sufficiently *Et idio quasi p erfecto in omnibus, quem caro iam reuocare non posset a gloria passionis, corona decernitur.* And therfore a » crown is decreed to him as to one perfect in all things » whome the flesh could not call back from the glory of » suffering. This conclusion M.S. (as his manner is) hath » left out, by which it is apparant, that Ambrose inferreth no singularitie of authoritie in Peter, as more perfet thē the rest of the Apostles, but as perfect in such degre, as the rest of the Apostles which were likewise prepared to martyrdō, were equal ẇ him therin. The testimony of Bernard a late writer, though he were no flatterer, yet I receiue not, as of one which was deceiued with the common error of his time.

But in signe that Peter was generall Shepheard, saith M. San. it is not read that he was ordained bishop of any other then of Christ, yet did he with two other Apostles ordaine S. Iames byshop of Ierusalem as Eus. lib. 2. cap. 0 writeth. There is no dout but Iames was acknowledged by the Apostles to be appointed by the holy ghoste to remaine at Ierusalem, though not as a perticuler bishop, but as an Apostle of the whole Church. But as we read not that Peter was made Bishop by any man, so we read not that he was made Byshop by Christ.

Yet Arnobius in Psa. 138. saith he was made a Bishop of Bishops. *Ecce Apostolo pœnitenti succurritur qui est episcoporum episcopus.* *Behold the Apostle beeing penitent is succoured, which is a Bishop of Bishops.* He asketh if any thing could be spoken more plainly? yes verely, you had need of plainer speaches then this, to proue that hee was byshop of the Apostles. For admit that he was an ouerseer of particular bishops, as the word ἐπίσκοπος doth signifie, yet it followeth not that he was an ouerseer or Byshop of the Apostles. In which sense Clemens also (if the Epistle were not counterfaite) might iustly call Iames a Byshop of Byshops, & not as M. Sand. aunsweareth that he was an Archbishop of inferior Byshops, but an Apo-

ſtle ouerſeer of particuler Biſhops.

That Cyprian ad Quintum ſayth: *Neque quiſquam &c Neither doeth any of vs make him ſelfe a Byſhoppe of Byſhops.* He aunſweareth that although no man may make himſelfe, yet Chriſte may make a man Biſhop of Byſhopes, but where findeth he that Chriſte maketh the Pope a Byſhop of Byſhoppes? Howe Peter might bee called a Byſhop of Byſhoppes, I haue ſhewed before But the Councell of Carth. 3. Cap. 26. forbiddeth that the Byſhop of Rome, or any other Primate ſhoulde be called the Prince of Prieſts, or higheſt Prieſt, or by any ſuch lyke name, but only the Byſhop of the firſt ſeate.

Yet Optatus feared nor to write thus, lib. 7. de ſchiſm. of S. Peter. *Preferri apoſtolis omnibus meruit &c. He deſerued to be preferred before all the Apoſtles, and he alone receiued the Keyes of the Kingdome of Heauen to be communicated vnto the reſte.* Maiſter Sander confeſſing and truely, that the Apoſtles tooke the Keyes belonging to their Apoſtolike office immediatly of Chriſte, ſaith they receiued the Keyes of their Byſhoplike office of Peter. But what lock was there, that they could not open and ſhut by their Aopſtolike Key? When Chriſte ſayth, Whatſoeuer you binde or looſe, & whoſe ſinnes ſoeuer you forgiue or retayne, which was the power of their Apoſtolike Keyes? If the Apoſtolike Keyes were ſo ſufficient, what neede they any Byſhoplike Keyes? Into theſe abſurdities both he & Optatus doe followe, whiles the one will vrge a prerogatiue of Peter, the other will forge a Byſhoplike office in the Apoſtles, whereof the Scripture giueth vs no inſtruction.

As for Leo and Gregorye Byſhoppes of Rome, although they were not come to the full pryde of Antichriſt, yet the myſterie of iniquitie hauing wrought in that ſeate, neere fiue or ſixe hundreth yeeres before them, and then greatly increaſed, they were ſo deceiued with the longe continuaunce of error, that they thought the dignitie of Peter was much more ouer the reſte of his fellowe Apoſtles, then the holy Scriptures

of

of God, (against which no continuaunce of error cann prescribe) doth either allow or beare with all. Wherefore although he haue some shewe out of the olde writers, yet hath he nothing directly to prooue that Peter did excell the other Apostles in Byshoplike authoritie, and out of the worde of God no one iote or tytle, that Peter as a Byshop excelled the other Apostles, not as Apostles, but as Byshops.

The 13 Chapter.

THat the pastorall and chiefe Byshops authoritie of Saint Peter, was an ordinary authoritie, and therefore it must goe for euer vnto his successors, where as the Apostolike authoritie beeing extraordinary hath no successors in it. The Church neuer lacked a visible rocke. Sander.

THat ỹ office of Apostles, which had general charge to preach ouer the whole world, is ceased with the Apostles liues, it is in deede graunted of vs: but that theyre Apostolike authoritie was extraordinary, or that all their authoritie is so determined, that it hath no successors in it, wee doe vtterly deny. For the same authoritie of preaching, of ministring the Sacraments, of binding and loosing, which the Apostles had is perpetuall in the Church, in the Byshops and elders, which are all successors of the Apostles. And if the Apostolike authoritie, hath no successors in it, what meaneth the Pope almoste in euery Bul and decretall Epistle, to brag so much of the Apostolike authoritie, & to ground all things *Apostolica Authoritate* by the Apostolike authoritie. By which it is euident, that M. Sand. new distinction of Apostolike and Byshoplike authoritie in the Apostles, is not acknowledged by the Popes themselues, but inuẽted lately by such as he is, to haue a starting hole, to seeme to auoid such arguments and authorites, as proue all the Apostles equall in authoritie. Fulke.

But

But let vs vs see what reasons he hath to proue, that S.Peters Pastorall authoritie was ordinary, and muste goe to his succeſſors, more then the Pastoral authoritie of euery Apoſtle. First S.Peter being but one man was not able to preach to all men at once, nor to gouerne nations newely conuerted, therefore hee had twelue companions adioyned to him.

But the worlde beeing conuerted, it is easy for the Pope without such fellowes, to gouerne all the faythful, by helpe of many inferiour officers. As thoughe the Church had not inferior officers in the Apoſtles time. If S.Peter then was not able to rule, w̃ had such greate giftes muchleſſe the Pope, which is nothing comparable with him in gifts, & is often a wicked man & an here tike is able to gouerne all the Church, for he hath not so great an helpe of the conuerſion of the worlde, as he hath a want of Peters gracious giftes, meete for such a gouernment.

Secondly he would haue vs mark, the peculiar names of a Rock, of a paſtor, & of a confirmer of his brethren, which are giuẽ by Christ to S.Peter alone, which argue that Peters supremacy muſt neceſſarily continue for euer. But who will graunt to M.S. that Christe gaue these peculier names to Peter alone, indeed that which is mẽt by the names is ordinary and perpetual in the Church. Peter was a Rock, not his perſon, but his doctrine that remaineth stil in the Church, he was a shephearde and confirmer of his brethren, and there bee nowe many shepheards and confirmers of their brethren.

Thirdly he sayth the Church neuer wanted a visible rock on the earth, beside the eternall Rock Christ: who in this life might bee so strongly faſtened in the Faith of Christe the great Rocke, that he (though not for his owne sake, yet for the Churches sake) might be able to stay vppe all other small stones, which ioyned vnto him, vntill Christ came in the fleshe, who likewise appointed Saincte Peter and his succeſſors to be this ordinary rock, as Adam, Enos, Henoch, Noe, Abraham,

Isaack

Isaac, Iacob, Moyses, Aaron and his succeſſors, who ſate in the chaire of Moyſes vntill the comming of Chriſt. Againſt this I ſay, that the church militant on earth, hath her foundation in heauen, and not on earth, therfore the churche hath not a viſible rocke in earth. Againe it is not true, that ſome one, hath alwayes bene this viſible rocke on earth. For who was greater Abraham or Melchiſedech? out of all controuerſie Melchiſedech, then was not Abraham the onely rocke. After the death of Iacob and the twelue Patriarkes, who was the viſible rocke vntill Moyſes was called. And yet had God a church among the Iewes all that time.

Thirdly who is ſo impudent to ſay, that all the ſucceſſors of Aaron were ſo ſtrongly faſtened in the faith, that they were able to ſtay all the ſmall ſtones that leaned vpon them. Was not Vrias the high Prieſt an idolater? 2. *Reg.* 16.

What were Iaſon, Menelaus, Lyſimachus by the reporte of the booke of Machabes? Was not Caiphas & Annas Sadducees by the teſtimonie of S. Luke *Act.* 5. and of Ioſephus? Where is then the viſible rocke, whoſe faith neuer failed &c? we ſee there was none ſuche before Chriſt, therefore there neede to be none ſuche after him.

His fourth reaſon is, of the name of a paſtor, which ſignifieth an ordinarie office, for as the ſheepe continue after S. Peters death, ſo muſt there be alſo a ſhepheard, as Peter was. But how proueth he that Peter was an only ſhepheard? forſooth Chryſoſtom ſayth *lib.* 2. *de ſacerdotio. Chriſtus ſanguinem &c. Chriſt hath ſhedde his blood to purchaſe thoſe ſheepe, the care of whom he did commit both to Peter & to Peters ſucceſſors.* But whom doth Chryſoſtom take for Peters ſucceſſors? the Biſhops of Rome only? No verily but all true paſtors of the church as his wordes going before doe manifeſtly declare: *Neque enim tum volebat teſtatum eſſe quantum à Petro amaretur, ſiquidem id multis nobis argumentis conſtabat. Verum hoc ille tum agebat, vt & Petrum & cæteros nos edoceret, quanta*

« *beneuolentia ac charitate erga suam ipse ecclesiam afficeretur,*
« *vt hac ratione & nos quoque eiusdem ecclesiæ studium cu-*
« *ramque toto animo susciperemus*. For his purpose was not
« then to testifie vnto vs, howe muche he was beloued of
« Peter for that was euident vnto vs by many arguments.
« But this thing then he intended, that he might teache
« both Peter and all vs, what beneuolence and loue he
« beareth towarde his church that by this reason we also
« might take vpon vs with all our hart, the loue & charge
« of the same church. This sentence sheweth that Chry-
sostome accounted him selfe & euery true pastor of the church a successor of Peter and not the Bishop of Rome alone.

As for Leo a Bishop of Rome I haue often protested that he was more addicted to the dignitie of his see, then the Scripture would beare him, and therefore was ouerruled and resisted, in the generall councel of Chalcedon.

His fift argument is a rule of lawe, where the same reason is, the same right ought to be. The reason of Peters confession and power is such as agreeth to any ordinary office, of the church, therefore the office of Peter being a rock, of strengthening his brethren and feeding Christes sheepe, is an ordinarie office. But I say, that Peters confession made him not a rock, but declared him so to be, being appoynted of Christ for one of the twelue foundations of the churche, the office of strengthening and feeding as it was not singular in Peter, so it is not ordinarie that it should be singular in any man.

His sixt reason, Irenæus, Optatus, and Augustine did recken vp such successors of Peter, as had liued till euerie of their ages or times. Therefore Peter had successors in his pastorall office. It is not denyed, but he had them, and other Bishoppes also successors in his pastorall office, at least the Bishoppes of Antioche, whereby your owne confession he was Bishoppe, before he came to Rome. Therefore his succession was not singular to the

the Bishoppes of one see.

His seuenth reason, no man may preache to them to whom he is not sent, therefore there must be a generall pastor to sende other to preache, to them that are not conuerted, to plant newe Bishoprikes, to controll them that are negligent, to supplie the thinges that lacke: to excommunicate such as liue in no diocesse &c. For sending he quoteth Rom. 10. where mention is onely of the sending of God, and of the sending by men. But all his questions and doubtes, may be aunswered. Either the whole church in generall councells, or euerie particular church in their synodes, as they shall see most expedient, may sende preachers as the Apostles and Elders sent Peter and Iohn into Samaria & order all such matters, as he imagineth must be done onely by the Pope. But he asketh who shall summon all other Bishoppes to generall or prouinciall councells. And I aske him, who summoned, the foure great & principall generall councells? and so many prouinciall councels, but the Emperours and Princes in whose dominion they were gathered? So that here is no necessary affaires of the church that doth require one generall pastor or Pope of Rome when all thinges may and haue bene done best of all without him.

As for placing of Bishoppes, in sees vacant, vniting of two Bishoprikes in one, or diuiding one into two, may better be done by the auctoritie of those churches, with consent of their Princes, who seeth and knoweth what is needefull in those cases, then by one which sittinge in his chaire at Rome, requireth halfe a yeares trauell, from some parte of the worlde, to him, before he can be aduertised of the case, and yet must vnderstande it by heare saye, and therefore not able to see what is expedient, so well as they that are present, and see the state of the matter. Finally it is against all likelyhoode, that Christ woulde make suche a generall sheepehearde ouer all his flocke, as many thousande sheepe, which liue vnder the Sophi, the Cham, the

Turke, can haue none acceſſe vnto, for ſuche thinges as are ſuppoſed neceſſarie to be had and to be obteyned from him onely. Wherefore if the Pope were heade of the churche, ſuche as by crueltie of tyrauntes are cut from him ſhoulde be cut from the bodie of the church. Yea if Hetheniſh tyrauntes coulde ſo much preuayle, as they do in hindring this gouernment of the Pope, (pretended to be ſo neceſſarie) the gates of hell might preuayle againſt the churche, contrarie to the promiſe of Chriſt.

The fourteenth Chapter.

Sander. *THat the ordinarie auctoritie of S. Peters primacie belongeth to one Biſhop alone. The whole gouernmēt of the church tendeth to vnitie.*

Fulke. COncerning Peters primacie, as there is litle in the Scriptures, wherupon it may be gathered, ſo I haue ſhewed, that it was not in him perpetuall. For there are greater arguments to proue the primacie of Iames. Agayne the greateſt ſhewe of Peters primacy, that we reade of in the Scriptures, is the primacie or heade Apoſtleſhippe of the circumciſion. So that if one Biſhoppe ſhould ſucceede him, in that primacie, he muſt be chiefe Biſhoppe ouer the Iewes, and not ouer the Gentiles. For the chiefe Apoſtleſhippe ouer the Gentiles, was by God committed to Paule. *Galat.* 2. 7. & 8. But if M. Sander ſay, as he doth in an other place, that the Pope ſucceedeth both theſe Apoſtles, and therefore hath both their auctoritie. Firſt he ouerthroweth his owne rocke of the church, which he will haue to be Peter alone. Secondlie his argument of vnitie, which he vrgeth in this chapter he ſubuerteth, if the Popes auctoritie be deriued from two heades. Thirdly he deſtroyeth his owne diſtinction of Biſhoplike and Apoſtolike auctoritie, if the Apoſtolike auctority of Paul ſhould deſcend

descend to the Pope by succession.

Nowe let vs consider what weighty reasons he hath, to proue the title of this chapter. S. Peters auctority was specified before the auctoritie was geuen to the rest, of binding & loosing. *Mat.* 18. Therfore seeing it was first in him alone, it ought to descend to one Bishop alone. But let M. Sander shew, where it was geuen to him alone, or promised to him alone ether. For the promise *thou shalt be called Peter*, gaue him no auctoritie, nor yet the performance thereof: *Thou art Peter*. But still the auctority is promised, *I will build, I will geue*, (1 reason as M. Sander doth of the Future tense) which promise being made *Math.* 16. is performed *Math.* 18. not to Peter onely, but to all the rest, and so all auctoritie is geuen in common *Iohan.* 20.

But S. Cyprian *ad Iubaianum*, sayth, that Christ gaue the auctority first to Peter. *Petro primus Dominus (super quem ædificauit ecclesiam, & vnitatis originem instituit & ostendit) potestatem istam dedit, vt id solueretur in terris, quod ille soluisset.* This doth M. Sander translate, *Our Lorde did first geue vnto Peter &c.* Wheras he should say: Our Lord » was the first that gaue to Peter (vpon whom he builded » his churche and instituted and shewed the beginninge » of vnity) this power, that whatsoeuer he loosed it should » be loosed in earth. This proueth, that the auctoritie » came first from Christ, but not that it was geuen first to Peter. And if we should vnderstand it so, that it was first geuen to Peter, yet he meaneth not, that it was geuen to reside in his person, but that in him as the attorney of the rest, it was geuen to them also, as he saith, *lib. 1. Ep. 3. Petrus tamen super quem ædificata ab eodem Domino fuerat ecclesia, vnus pro omnibus loquens & Ecclesiæ voce* » *respondens, ait Domine ad quem ibimus &c.* Yet Peter » vpon whome the churche had beene builded, by the » same our Lorde, as one speaking for all, and aunswering » in the voyce of the church sayeth: Lorde whether shall » we goe &c. as he spake for all, so he receaued for all. » Which thing if it had bene so (as we finde not in the

Scripture) yet could it haue beene no ordinary matter, to diſcend to one by ſucceſſion. For the power beeing once receiued by one in the name of the reſte, and by him deliuered to the reſt, it ſhould be continued in ſucceſſion of euery one that hath receiued it, and not euery day to be fetched a new from a ſeuerall heade. For that beginning came from vnitie, which Cyprian ſpeaketh of, when Peter beeing one, was the voice & mouth of the reſt, and ſo receiued power for the reſt, which being once receiued, the church holdeth of Chriſte, and not of Peter or his ſucceſſors, no more then a corporation holdeth of him, that was their atturney, to receiue either lands or authoritie from the Prince, but holdeth immediatly of the Prince. Wherfore this argument followeth not, although the authoritie had begon in one, that it ſhould continue in one.

The ſecond reaſon is, that the moſt perfect gouernment is meete for the Church, but moſt perfection is in vnitie, therefore there ought to be one chiefe gouernor of all. This one chiefe gouernour is our Sauiour Chriſt, ruler both in heauen & in earth. Who aſcending into heauen, did not appoynt one Pope ouer all his church, but Apoſtles, Euangeliſtes, Prophets, Paſtors and teachers, that we might all meete in the vnitie of faith, and grow into a perfect man. *Eph.* 4. 11. & 13.

The third reaſon is, that the ſtate of the newe Teſtament, muſt be more perfect then the law, but in the law, there was one high paſtor, the high Prieſt on earth, therefore there muſt be one now alſo and much rather. I aunſwere we haue him in deede, our chiefe Biſhop & high Prieſt, of whome the Aaronicall Prieſt, was but a ſhadow, namely Ieſus Chriſt, whoſe gouernment is nothing leſſe perfect and beneficiall to his church in that he ſitteth in heauen, and hath as before is cited lefte an ordinarie miniſterie on earth in many Paſtors and teachers ouer euerie ſeuerall congregation and not in one Pope ouer al, which could not poſſibly either know, or attend to decide, the one thouſande parte of controuerſies,

uersies, which are determined by ỹ auctoritie of Christs law, and such ministers as he hath ordeyned.

The fourth reason is of auctority. Cyprian *ad Iubaianum: Ecclesia quæ vna est &c. The church which is one was founded by our Lordes voyce vpon one, which receaued the keyes thereof.* And againe, *de simplicitat. prælat. Quamuis &c. Although Christ after his resurrection geueth equall power to all his Apostles and sayth: as my father sent me so do I send you: receaue the holy Ghost. If you remit to any man his sinnes they shal be remitted. And if you retaine them, they shal be reteined, yet that he might shew the vnitie, he disposed by his auctoritie, the originall of that vnitie, beginning of one.* But Cyprian proceedeth: *Hoc erant &c. Verely the rest of* » *the Apostles were the same thing that Peter was, endued with* » *equall fellowshippe both of honor and of power, but the begin-* » *ning proceedeth from vnitie, that the church might be shewed* » *to be one.* Theſe wordes are playne to declare, that Cy- » prian acknowledgeth no inequalitie of the Apoſtles, in reſpect of any auctoritie they had. Alſo that the building of the church vpon one, and the receauing of the keyes of one, was not an ordinarie office to diſcende, by ſucceſſion, but a ſingular priuiledge, for that one tyme to ſhewe the beginning, and not the continuaunce of the power to proceede from one, but to be helde alwayes of one, which is Ieſus Chriſt, without any ſhadowes of one Biſhoppe on earth to ſignifie the ſame, when Chriſt is reuealed with open face vnto vs nowe ſitting in heauen. 2. *Cor.* 3. 18.

The like thing teacheth Optatus *lib.* 2. *de ſchiſm. Vt in vna &c. That in one chaire in which Peter ſate, vnity might be kept of all men, leaſt the reſt of the Apoſtles ſhoulde euerie one challenge a chaire to him ſelfe: ſo that he ſhoulde nowe be a ſchiſmatike and a ſinner, that againſt a ſingular chaire, ſhould place an other. Therfore in that one chaire which is chiefe in giftes, Peter ſate firſt.* His meaning is to defende the vnitie of the churche againſt the Donatiſtes, but of the auctoritie of Peters chaire ouer all other Biſhoppes chaires, if he had ſpoken any thing M. Sander

would not haue concealed it, which doth vs great wrong to thinke that we can not distinguishe a chaire of vnitie, from a chaire of auctoritie.

The place of Hierom *cont. Iouin. lib.* 1. hath bene aunswered once or twise, shewing that among the Apostles which were equall, Peter was chosen to be primate, to auoide contention, which was a primacy of order and not of auctority. As for the collection of Leo Bishoppe of Rome, that Peters primacy was a platforme, for other Bishops to vnderstād, that they must haue a Bishop ouer them, if the very Apostles had an head among them, sauoreth of the ambition incident to that see, which was appoynted to be the seate of Antichrist. Although neither Leo him selfe, challēged so much as the Pope doth nowe, neither the Bishops of his time, would yeeld vnto him in so muche as he challenged. For beside the whole generall councel of Chalcedon, that concluded against him, about the priuiledges of the Bishop of Constantinople, wherein they made him equall with the Bishoppe of Rome, the title of seniority onely reserued, it appeareth by his Epistles, that many Bishops acknowledged not such primacy ouer them, as he claimed, whereof he complaineth in diuerse of his Epistles.

The place of Cyprian *lib.* 1. *Epist.* 3. *that heresies haue sprong because one Iudge is not acknowledged in steede of Christ, for the time, to whom the whole brotherhood might obey* He can not deny but it is ment of Cyprian of one Iudge in euery dioceſse. But he reasoneth a fortiori, that there ought to be much rather one Iudge ouer all the world. Howbeit I haue shewed the inconsequence of this argument, by example of one Phisitian, one Schoolemaister, one Iudge in temporall matters ouer the whole worlde, to whom it is as impossible to discharge suche an office ouer all, as it is profitable for one suche to be in euerie towne. He sayth that particular flockes, are voluntarie, and likewise particular pastors, but one flocke and one pastor, is of absolute necessitie on earth. In deede the limites of particular flockes, and the persons of particular pastors,

pastors, are left to the appoyntment and choise of the church. But that there should be particular flockes and pastors, it is of Gods ordination, though God by his Apostles appoynted it to be so, yet is it of as absolute necessity, while the church is dispersed in diuerse places of the world, as that there is one flocke and one shepheard ouer all Iesus Christ, and yet he is not ashamed to challenge vs pag. 298. *Let the text be named where Christ did institute many parishes?* Whereas he him selfe, pag. 294. quoteth. *Tit.* 1. & *Act.* 14. which places proue, that Christ did institute many parishes, except he will say the Apostles did it without the institution of Christ, which he confesseth they did not without the speciall inspiration of the holy Ghost: or else will say, that the inspiration of the holy Ghost in the ordinaunce of many parishes, differeth from the institution of Christ. But he that wrangleth thus impudently and vnreasonably, against the playne institution of many parishes by Christ, bringeth a playne text where it is sayd, *Feede me sheepe to one pastor.*

Hath this man any foreheade thinke you, that calleth this a playne text to proue that there shoulde be one sheepehearde vpon earth ouer all the flocke, because Christ vpon speciall occasion exhorted one man to feede his flocke? Are all thinges that were spoken to him singular vnto him? Christ sayd to him and to none other of the Apostles, come after me Satan, thou art an offense to me, for thou sauerest not the thinges that are of God but of men. Christ sayed to Peter and to none other, put vp thy sworde into thy scaberd, Christ sayed to Peter and to none other, thou wilt denye me thrise. O paynted rocke of the Popishe Churche, that hathe no better grounde then this saying *feede my sheepe* when he that challengeth auctoritie hereby of all other feedeth least, and poysoneth most.

But let vs returne and see what auctoritie of olde fathers he hath to proue one pastorall preheminence o-

uer all the churche: Cyprian *lib.1.Ep.8. Deus vnus est, & Christus vnus, & vna ecclesia, & Cathedra vna super petram Domini voce fundata.* There is one God, and one Christ, and one churche, and one chaire founded vpon Peter by our Lordes voyce. Heare I say first of all, that he doth falsifie Sainct Cyprians wordes turning *petram* into *petrum*, so that his saying is, There is one chaire by our Lordes voyce founded on the rocke. An other altar or a new Priesthoode can not be appointed beside one altar and one Priesthoode. Whosoeuer gathereth elsewhere scattereth abroad &c.

But if the worde were *petrum* and not *petram*, yet the whole discourse of that Epistle sheweth, that Cyprian meaneth by these wordes to set forth not the pastorall preheminence of one man ouer the whole church, but one Bishop in euery dioceese. For he writeth against fiue Elders or Priestes, which had chosen one Felicissimus a schismatike, to be Bishop in Carthage against him.

But what other malicious ignorance, or shameles impudence is this, that he peruerteth the saying of Christ of him selfe, to the Pope? *There shall be one sheepefold & one shepheard. Ioan.*10 Yet see his reason. *A flocke of shepe is one by force of one pastor, therefore if the Pastor on earth be not one, the flocke is not one on earth.* If this argument be good, howe is the flocke one vpon earth, when there is no Pope? For the see hath bene voyde diuerse times, many dayes, many monethes, & somtime many yeares. Howe was the flocke one, when there were two or three Popes at once and that so often, and so long together? Therefore the flocke on earth is one by that one onely shepheard Iesus Christ, whose diuine voice all the shepe heare, though in his humanity, he be ascended into heauen, and not by any one mortal man, to whom they can not be gathered, nether being so farre abroad dispersed, can heare his voyce.

And the whole order of the church on earth, tendeth to an vnitie in Christ, & not in one man whatsoeuer, as one generall pastor. For if that one shoulde be an here-

tike,

tike, and all the church tend to vnity in him, the whole church ſhould be wrapped in hereſie with him. That diuerſe Popes haue bene heretiks as Liberius, Anaſtaſius, Vigilius, Honorius, Ihon the 23. in knowne condemned hereſies, it is too manifeſt by recordes of antiquitie, that it ſhoulde be denyed, wherefore Chriſt inſtituted no ſuch ordinary auctoritie, to be limited in one ſucceſſiō that it ſhould haue preheminēce & iuriſdiction ouer all the churche. Seeing vnity is beſt mainteyned in doctrine by his word, in gouernment, by the diſcipline by him appoynted. And vnity in truth can not be had at the handes of a man, which is a lyer, & experience ſheweth that the iuriſdiction which the Biſhoppe of Rome hath claimed, hath bene occaſion of moſt and greateſt ſchiſmes and diſſentions that haue bene in particular churches, whē no man would obey his ordinary paſtors and Biſhops without the appealing to the ſee of Rome, beſide ſo many ſchiſmes as haue bene in the ſame ſee, which haue ſet all the Chriſtian world together by the eares, while they were deuided in factiōs, ſome holding with one Pope, and ſome with an other, and ſome with the third, and ſome with none of them all.

The 15. Chapter.

THat the Biſhop of Rome is that one ordinarie paſtor who ſucceedeth in S. Peters chaire, and is aboue all Biſhoppes according to the meaning of Gods worde. VVhy S. Peter dyed at Rome. S. Auguſtines minde touching the ſupremacy of the Pope of Rome. Sander.

THe firſt reaſon is, that although Peter at the firſt was rather high Biſhoppe of the circumciſion, thē of the Gentiles, yet becauſe he did at length ſettle him ſelfe at Rome by Gods appointment, and left a ſucceſſor there, he ſayeth he may well affirme, that the Biſhop of Romes primacy is warranted by Gods word. A ſtraūge kind of warantiſe, for to omit that the primacy ouer the Fulke.

Gentils by Gods worde, is giuen to another, namely to Paule, from whom he can neuer proue, that it was taken afterward. Where hath he any worde of God to proue, that by his appointment, Peter setled him self at Rome, and appoynted there a succeſſor? He quoteth Irenæus *lib. 3. cap. 3.* who reporteth that Linus the firſt Biſhop of Rome was ordayned not by Peter onely, but by Peter & Paule the Apoſtles, who founded the Church there, euen as Polycarpus by the Apoſtles in Aſia, was made biſhop in Smyrna, which Church with the Church of Epheſus founded by Paule, and continued by Iohn the Apoſtles, he citeth as witneſſes alike, with the Church of Rome, of the tradition of the Apoſtles, againſt Valentinus and Marcion which being voyd of Scriptures, bragged of the tradition of the Apoſtles. But of Peters primacie, or his ſucceſſors ouer all Biſhops, Irenæus ſayth not a word. No more doth Tertullian, whom likewiſe he quoteth, *de præſcrip.* but euen as Irenæus would haue the tradition of the Apoſtles, againſt thoſe heretikes that boaſted of it, to be tryed by the cõfeſſion of thoſe Churches that were founded by the Apoſtles.

His ſecond reaſon is, vpon a falſe ſuppoſition, that he hath already proued, Peter alone to be the rocke, to haue chiefe authoritie in feeding &c. all which thinges are vntrue.

That Peter came to Rome, he is not content that it be teſtified by all auncient Eccleſiaſticall writers. But he ſayth it is witneſſed by the expreſſe word of God. 1. *Pet. 5. The Church which is gathered together in Babylon ſalueth you.* Although the hiſtory of Peters comming to Rome, and ſitting there 25. yeares, teſtified by ſo many writers, is proued falſe, in many circumſtances, by the playne worde of God, yet I am content to admitte, that he came thither, towarde the later ende of Neroes raigne. But that in his Epiſtle, he ſent ſalutations from Rome, I can not admitte: ſeeing that in ſuch manner of ſalutations, men vſe not to write allegorically, albeit, that in the reuelation of Saint Iohn Rome the ſea of Antichriſt

is mystically called Babylō. But Babylon from whence S. Peter did write, is more probably to be taken, for a citye of that name in Egypt, where Marke was with him, whō the consent of antiquitie affirmeth, to haue bene Bishop of Alexandria a citie of Egypt also, who coulde not haue bene with him at Rome. Seeing it is manifest by the first and seconde of the Epistle to the Galathians, and by diuerse of Saint Paules Epistles, that if euer Peter was at Rome, it was but a short tyme in the later ende of Nero his Empire. Whereas Marke dyed in the eyght yeare of his raigne, before Peter coulde be at Rome. For in the tenth yeare Paule was brought prisoner to Rome, Saint Luke accompanying him, who would not haue omitted to shewe, that Peter was there to haue mette him, as the rest of the brethren did, if he had then bene at Rome. Agayne Paule in so many Epistles as he writeth from Rome, sending salutations from meane personages, would not haue omitted mention of Peter, if he had bene there. Saint Luke then affirming that he taryed two yeares in prison at Rome, which must be vntil the twelfe yeare of Nero, it followeth that if Peter came, he came very late to Rome within two yeare before his death, at which tyme it was not possible, that Marke which was dead foure yeares before, could be at Rome with him, wherefore Babylon in that text can not be taken for Rome.

Another reason of the Popes supremacy he maketh, that Peter not onely came thither, but also dyed there. A simple reason, why the city of Rome should haue that prerogatiue, because she murthered ỹ Apostles. Rather might Ierusalē clayme it, in which Christ the head of all dyed. After this he telleth the fable out of the counterfait Egesippus, of Simon Magus flying in the ayer, & the Emperour Nero his great delight in his sorcerye. The credit of Egesippus he defendeth, by blaming his translatour for adding names of cities, which had none such when Egesippus liued. But that Simon Magus shewed no experiment of sorcerye before Nero, as this coun-

terfait Egesippus reporteth it is plaine, by Plinius *lib.* 30. *cap.* 2. *natur. Histor.* who shewing how desirous Nero was, and what meanes he had to haue triall thereof, yet neuer could come by any. It was a practise of old time, to fayne such fables, for loue of the Apostles, as Tertullian witnesseth, *de baptis.* of a Priest of Asia, that was conuicted & confessed, that he fained for the loue of Paule, a writing vnto Tecla, in which many absurd things were contayned. Againe so many Apocriphall gospells, epistles, itineraryes and passions, as are counterfaited vnder the name of Apostles, and auncient fathers, who knoweth not to be fables and false inuentions. Amonge which this fable of Simon Magus and Peter is one. That S. Luke maketh no mention of Peters death, he preuenteth the obiection, because he continued not his storye so farre: which doubt (sayth he) he woulde not haue omitted, if he had gone so farre forward in his story. But seeing he brought Paule to Rome, both in his iorney, and in his history, why maketh he no mention of Peters being there? which if their story were true, must haue sit there twenty yeares before. To omit therefore the foure causes, why Peter should dye at Rome, whereof three are taken out of a counterfait, *August. de sa. Etu, hom.* 27. the 4. out of Leo & Gregory Bishops of Rome: he commeth to decyde the controuersie betwene the Greekes & Latines, who was first successor of Peter, Linus or Clemens, taking parte with them that affirme, Clemens although Irenæus the most auncient writer of any that is extant, name Linus who was not a Grecian farre of, but a Frenchman at Lyons neare hand to Italy, whose authority although he reiect, in naming Linus to be ordayned Bishop by both the Apostles, yet he glorieth much that he calleth the Churche of Rome, *Maximam & antiquissimam, &c. The greatest and the most auncient, & knowen to all men, founded and setled by two most glorious Apostles, Peter and Paule.* And agayne, *Ad hanc Ecclesiam &c. To this Church by reason of the mightier principalitie, euery Church, that is, the faithful that are euery where*

must

must needes agree. But he proceedeth and sheweth the cause why. *In qua semper ab his qui sunt vndique conserua-* »
ta est ea quæ est ab Apostolis traditio. In which alwayes »
that tradition which is from the Apostles hath bene al- »
waies kept, of them that are round about. M. Sander cal- »
leth it willful ignorance, in M. Iewel, that sayth the mighty principalitie spoken of in Irenæus, is ment of the ciuill dominion, and Romane Empire, whereas it hath relation to the former titles of commendation, that it was the greatest and the most auncient: the greatest he sayth, because it was fownded by Peter the greatest Apostle, but so sayth not Irenæus, for he sayth it was founded by two most glorious Apostles, and not by Peter alone. It was then greatest, because the greatest number of Christians were in Rome, as the greatest citie. *But howe is it the most auncient? but in respect of Peters seniorities, for otherwise Ierusalem and Antioche were auncienter in tyme.* I aunswer two wayes, first it is sophisticall to vrge the superlatiue degree grammatically, as when we saye, *potentissimo principi*, to the most mightye prince, *doctissimo viro*, to the best learned man, &c. We doe not meane, that no Prince is equall or superiour in power, nor that no mã is equall or superiour in learning, to him whome we so commende, but to shewe the power and learning of those persons to be excellent great.

Secondly I aunswer, that Irenæus speaketh coniunctly, it is sophisticall to vnderstande seuerally. He saith there is no Church of such greatnes, so auncient, and so well knowen, as the Church of Rome.

From this blinde collection out of Irenæus, he commeth downe groping to Cyprian, who speaking of certayne factious heretikes, that sayled from Carthage to Rome, to complayne of Saint Cyprian and other Bishops of Afrike to Pope Cornelius. *Lib. 1. Ep. 3. ad Cor. Audent & ad Petri, &c. They dare cary letters from schismaticall and prophane men vnto the chayer of Peter, and the principall Churche, from whence the prieſtly vnitie beganne. Nether consider that they are Romanes, whose sayth*

is prayſed by the report of the Apoſtle vnto whom falſhod can haue none acceſſe.

In this ſaying we muſt note the priuiledges of S. Peters ſupremacie, to be at Rome. 1. *This is S. Peters chayer, that is his ordinary power of teaching, &c.* Nay rather the Biſhops ſeate, which he and Paule did ſet vp there as Irenæus ſheweth, *li. 3. ca. 3. 2. There is the principal Church, becauſe the Biſhop of Rome ſucceedeth the prince of the Apoſtles.* Nay rather, becauſe it is the greateſt Church, being gathered in the greateſt citie of the world, as Irenæus alſo calleth it. 3. *The prieſtly vnitie beganne not in Rome but in Peter, therefore there is the whole authoritie of Peter.* The argument is nought, the beginning of vnitie proueth not authoritie. 4. *this worde vnitie doth import, that as Peter alone had in him the whole power of the chiefe ſheepeheard, ſo Cornelius his ſucceſſor hath in him the ſame power.* This argument is of ſmall importance, for nether had Peter alone ſuch power, nor any of his ſucceſſors. 5. *where he ſayth infidelitie can haue no acceſſe to the Romanes, what other thinge is it, then to ſaye in the Church of Rome he ruleth for whoſe faith Chriſt prayed. Luc. 22.*

Chriſt prayed for the faith of all his Apoſtles, and of all his Diſciples, to the ende of the worlde. *Ioan. 17.* Beſide this, Maiſter Sander tranſlateth *perfidia* which ſignifieth falſhood or falſe dealing, infidelitie, ſecondly that which Cyprian ſayth of all the faythfull Romanes, he draweth to his Pope, thirdly where Cyprian ſheweth howe longe they ſhall continue without falſhoode, namely ſo long as they retayne the fayth prayſed by the Apoſtle, he maketh it perpetuall to the ſea of Rome: whereas the Romanes them ſelues write to Cyprian of
" thoſe prayſes of the Apoſtle, *quarum laudum & gloriæ*
" *degenerem fuiſſe, maximum crimen eſt.* Of which prayſes and glorye to be growne out of kinde, it is the greateſt cryme. Finally if Cyprian had thought the Pope and Churche of Rome coulde not erre, he woulde neuer haue mayntayned an opinion againſt them, as he did

did in rebaptisinge them that were baptised by heretikes.

The 6. We must adde heareto, that *Cyprian calleth Rome Ecclesiæ Catholicæ matricem & radicem, the mother & roote of the Catholike church. lib4. Epist.8.* we find not Rome so called there, we find that Cyprian & his fellowes, exhorted all such troublesome persons, as went ouer sea, & caried false tales, *Vt Ecclesiæ Catholicæ matricē & radicem agnoscerent & tenerent*, that they woulde acknowledg & holde the mother and roote of the Catholike Church, by which wordes, they disswaded them from ioyninge with schismatikes, who being condemned in one Church, would gad vp and downe for absolution in an other.

The 7. did not S. Cyp. confesse Cornelius to haue receiued the appellation of Basilides lawfully, out of Spaine? li.1 Ep.4. There is no word of any such confession or appellation, in that epistle. But rather, if you suppose an appellation & a restitution by the Byshop of Rome, Cyprian & 36. bishops with him, determine the same restitution to be voide & of none effect: *Neque rescindere ordinationem iure perfectam potest, quod Basilides post crimina sua detecta, & conscientiam propria confessione nudatam, Romam pergens, Stephanum collegam nostrum longe positum & gestæ rei ac veritatis ignarum fefellit, vt ambiret reponi se iniustè in episcopatum, de quo fuerat iustè depositus. Hæc eò pertinent vt Basilidis, non tam abolita sint quam cumulata delicta, vt ad superiora peccata eius, etiam fallaciæ & circumuentionis crimen accesserit. Neque enim tam culpandus est ille cui negligenter obrepsit, quam hic execrādus qui fraudulenter obrepsit. Obrepere autē hominibus Basilides potuit, Deo nō potest, cū scriptū sit, Deus non irridetur:* Neither can it make frustrate the ordination lawfully made, ỳ Basilides after his crimes were detected, & his cōsciēce opened by his owne confession, going to Rome, hath deceiued our fellow bishop Stephan, being farre of & ignorāt of ỳ matter & of ỳ truth, ỳ he might ābitiously seeke to be vniustlye restored into his bishoprick frō ẁ he was iustly deposed

" Theſe things tend to this ende, that the offences of Baſilides, are not ſo much aboliſhed as increaſed, ſo that to his former ſinnes the cryme of deceifulneſſe and circumuention is added. For neither is he ſo much to be blamed who was negligently deceiued, as he is to bee abhorred, which did craftely deceiue him. But if Baſilides could deceiue men, he coulde not deceiue God, ſeeing it is written, God is not mocked.

Heere is no lawefull appellation ſpoken of, but the Biſhope of Romes ſentence pronounced voyde, and he blamed for his negligence and raſhneſſe, to medle with matters whereof he coulde haue no knowledge, by meanes of diſtance of place. But if M. San. reply, that he is not reproued for taking ſuch appellations, he muſt heare what Cyprian ſayth of ſuch appellations which began to be vſed in his daies, vnto Cornelius B. of Rome immediatly after the woordes cyted by him. lib. 1 epi. 3. of thoſe ſchiſmatikes that were ſo bolde as to ſayle to Rome, and carry letters as aboue. *Quæ autem cauſa veniendi & pſeudoepiſcopum contra epiſcopos factum nunciandi? Aut enim placet illis quod fecerunt & in ſuo ſcelere perſeuerant, aut ſi diſplicet & recedunt, ſciunt quo reuertantur. Nam cum ſtatutũ ſit omnibus nobis, & æquum ſit pariter & iuſtũ, vt vnuſcuiuſq; cauſa illic audiatur, vbi eſt crimen admiſſum, & ſingulis paſtoribus portio gregis ſit aſcripta, quam regat vnuſquiſq;, & gubernet, rationem ſui actus Domino redditurus, oportet vtique eos quibus preſumus non circumcurſare, nec epiſcoporum concordiam coherentem ſua ſubdola & fallaci temeritate collidere. Sed agere illic cauſam ſuam, vbi & accuſatores habere & teſtes ſui criminis poſſint, niſi paucis deſperatis & perditis, minor videtur eſſe auctoritas epiſcoporum in Africa conſtitutorum, qui iam de illis iudicauerunt & eorum conſcientiam multis delictorum laqueis vinctã iudicij ſui nuper grauitate damnarũt*: But what cauſe had they to come and to report that a falſe Byſhop was made againſt the Byſhops: For either that which they haue done pleaſeth them, & they continew in their wickedneſſe, or if it diſpleaſe thẽ, and they goe back from

it

it, they knowe whether they shoulde returne. For wher- »
as it is decreed of vs all, & is also meete and right, that »
euery mans cause should be hard there, where the crime »
was committed, and a portion of the flocke is commit- »
to euery Pastor, which euery one ought to rule and go- »
uerne, as he that shall yeelde an account of his doings »
to the Lord: verily it behoueth them ouer whome wee »
haue rule, not to runne about, neither by their craftie & »
deceitful rashnes to crase the concord of Byshops agree- »
ing togither: but there to plead their matter wher they »
may haue both accusers and witnesses of their crime, »
except the authorytyof the Byshops ordeined in Africa »
seemeth to a few desperate and wicked fellowes to bee »
lesse, which haue already iudged of them, and condem- »
ned their consciences, bounde with the waight of their »
iudgement in many cordes of their offences. This place »
of Cyprian declareth not onely that the Byshopps of Africa, had decreede against such appellations, but also that they thought theyr authoritie nothing inferior to the Byshops of Italy, nor to the byshop of Rome him self.

The 8. note out of Cyprian is, *That he required Stephanus the Pope, to depose Marcianus the Byshop of Arles in Fraunce, which to doe in an other prouince is a signe that the Pope of Rome is aboue other Bishops.* If it were true that M. Sander sheweth, it might proue the Bishop of Rome, to be a Primate or Metropolitane, it coulde not proue him to be a Byshop ouer all the world. But it is vtterly false, that he saith, *Cyprian required the Pope Stephan to depose him*, for he was deposed by the iudgement of all the Byshops of the Weste Churche: *Ab vniuersis sacerdotibus iudicatus*, condemned of all the Priestes, onely hee exhorteth Stephan of Rome, which was negligēt in this behalfe, to ioyne with the reste of the Byshoppes of Fraunce in ordering of another Byshopp in his steade, who long since hath beene excommunicated and deposed from his place, for taking parte with Nouatiane the Heretike. And lest you should think the whole matter to be referred to the Byshop of Rome, these are is

« words in the same Epistle.li.3.Ep.13.*Id circo enim frater*
« *charissime,copiosum corpus est sacerdotum concordiæ mutuæ*
« *glutine atq; vnitatis vinculo copulatum vt si quis ex collegio*
« *nostro hæresim facere & gregem Christi lacerare & vastare*
« *tentauerit,subueniant cæteri & quasi pastores vtiles & mi-*
« *sericordes,oues dominicas in gregem colligant:* For therfore
« most welbeloued brother, the bodie or fellowshippe of
« priestes is plentifull, beeing coupled togither by the
« Glewe of mutuall concorde,and the bande of Amitie,
« so that if any of our company shall assay to make an he-
« resie,or to rente or waste the flocke of Christ,the reste
« should giue ayde,and as profitable and mercifull shep-
« heards gather againe the Lords sheepe into his folde.

The 9.note is, *That notwithstanding Cyprian dissented from Pope Stephanus in opinion concerning the baptizing of suchas had ben baptised by heretikes, yet hee denyed not his prerogatiue.but kept still the vnitie of the militant Church,in acknowledging the visible head thereof.* He quoteth his ep. *Contra Stephan*, wherin is no word of acknowledging the Popes prerogatiue,but contrary wise euery childe may see,that seeing he did boldly dissent in opinon frō the B.of Rome, &wrote against him, he helde no such prerogatiue of that sea,as the Papists now maintaine, that the bishop of Rome cannot erre.In deede Cyprian professeth,that notwithstanding he differed from him in opinion,yet he would not departe from the vnitie of the Church,but what is this for acknowledging of a visible head, wherof M.S.speaketh much, but Cypriau neuer a word,neither in that place,nor in any of all his workes.

The next authoritie is Hippolitus whose words Prud. rehearseth:Peristeph.in passion Hip. *Respondesfugite &c.*

His answvere vvas O flee the seismes of cursed Nouates lore:
And to the Catholike folke and flocke,your selues againe restore.
Let onely one faith rule and raigne,kept in the Church of olde:
VVhich faith both Paule doth stil retaine & Peters chair doth holde

No dout this was a good exhortation,so longe as the temple of Peter aud Paule at Rome did holde the olde catholike faith:from which seeing the Pope is now fled, we may not honor the emptie chaire of Peter, to think there

there is his faith, where his doctrine is not.

After Hippolitus, followeth Sozomenus, who reporteth that Athanasius and certaine other Byshops of the Greeke Church came to Rome to Iulius the byshopp there, to complaine that they were vniustly deposed by the Arians. Wherevpon the Byshop of Rome finding them vpon examination to agree with the Nicene coũcel *did receiue them into the communion as one that had care of them all, for the worthynes of his owne See, and did restore to euery of them their owne Churches. &c.* Heere M. Sander hath his 9. obseruations, he delighteth much in that number. But it shall not neede to stand vpon them, it is cõfessed that in Sozomenus time, the writer of this story, who iudgeth of things done according to the present state in which he lyued, the sea of Rome was growne into great estimation, and counted the first See or principall in dignitie of all Byshops Seas in the worlde. Yea, it is true that Socrates a writer of Historyes as well as he sayeth, That long before his time, the Byshops Sea of Rome aswel as of Alexandria, was growne beyonde the bands of Priesthood, into a forraine Lordship & dominion. Soc. lib. 7. cap. 11. But if we consider the recordes of the very time in which Iulius lyued, we shall not finde that the dignitie of his Sea was such, as that he hadde such authoritie as Sozomenus ascribeth to him, and much lesse such as M. Sander imagineth of him.

In Epiphanius there is an Epistle of one Marcellus, which beside that he called him his fellow minister, acknowledgeth no such dignitie of his Sea lib. 3. to. 1. And Sozomenus himselfe testifyeth that the Bishops of the East, derided & contemned his commandementes, lib. 3. Cap. 8. & cap. 11. they were as bolde to depose him with the byshops of the West, as he was to check them, that they called not him to their councel. Wherein as I confesse, they did euell, yet thereby they shewed euidently, that the Christian worlde in those dayes, did not acknowledge the vsurpation of the bishop of Rome, as M. Sander saith they did. Neither durst they euer to

disſent from him, if it had beene a Catholike doctrine receiued in the Church, that the Byſhopp of Rome is head of the Church, Byſhop of all Byſhops, Iudge of all cauſes, and one which cannot erre. As for Athanaſius, Paulus, &c. and other Byſhops beeing toſſed to and fro, by their enemyes, no maruaile if they were glad to finde any comfort at the Byſhop of Romes hands, hauing firſt ſought to the Emperors for refuge, of whome ſometime they were holpē, ſometime they wer hindred as informatiō was giuen either for them or againſt thē.

But Arnobius he ſayeth giueth a maruailous witnes for the church of Rome in Pſa. 106. *Petrus in deſerto. &c Peter wandering in the deſert of this worlde, vntill he came to Rome, preached the baptiſme of Ieſus Chriſt in whome all floods are bleſſed from Peter vnto this day. He hath made the going forth of the waters into thirſt, ſo that he which ſhall goe forth of the Church of Peter ſhal periſh for thirſt.* It is a maruelous witte of M. Sander, that can find ſuch maruelous prerogatiue of Peter, in this place which Arnobius would haue in the example of Peter to be vnderſtoode of all men. *Quid eſt aſcendunt? Diſce in Petro, vt quod in ipſo inueneris, in omnibus cernas. Aſcendit Petrus &c.* What meaneth this they goe vp as highe as heauen? Learne in Peter, to thend that ỳ which thou ſhalt find in Peter, thou mayſt ſee in all men. Peter went vp as high as heauen, when he ſayd: Although I ſhould dye with thee, yet will I not deny thee &c. and ſo applying the vnderſtanding of the Pſalme to Peter, and in him to all Chriſtiās, he cōmeth to that maruelous teſtimony of the church of Rome, which M. Sander reporteth, ſhewing how after his repentance God exalted him to be a preacher of that baptiſme of Ieſus Chriſt in whome all floodes are bleſſed from Peter to this day. Where M. Sander vſeth a falſe tranſlation, ſaying the floodes are bleſſed of Peter, and expoundeth the floodes to be the churches, whereas Arnobius ſpeaketh of all waters, which in Chriſt are ſanctified to the vſe of baptiſme, from the Apoſtles time vntill this day. But it is a Catholike argument that whoſoeuer

soeuer goeth out of the Church of Peter, goeth out of the Church of Christe, therefore Rome is the mother Church and Peter the heade thereof. Euen lyke this, whosoeuer goeth out of the Church of Paule, or of any of the Apostles whereſoeuer they planted it, doth perish therefore Corinth and Paule, or any other Citie & the Apostle that preached there, may be taken for the head and Pastor, and mother Church of all other, yet is this with M. Sander a meruailous testimony.

Optatus succeeded Arnobius. Cont. Pamen de nat: lib. 2. *Negare non potes. &c.* Thou canst not deny, but that thou knowest that to Peter first the bishops chaire was giuen in the citie of Rome, in which Peter the head of al the apostles hath sit: wherof he was also called Cephas, in which chair vnitie might be kept of al men, so that he should be a sciſmatike ẅ should place any other chaire against the singular chaire. Vnto Peter succeeded Linus, vnto Linus succeded Clemens, & so nameth all the Byshops vntil Siricius which liued in his time, of whom he saith, *Qui noſter eſt ſocius*, which is our fellow. In this sentence Optatus laboreth to proue against the Donatists which were sciſmatikes, that ther is but one Catholike church frō which they were departed. He vseth the argumēt of vnitie commended in Peters chaire whom he calleth head of the Apostles in respecte of vnitie, & not of authority, which appeareth by this that in the end he accounteth Syricius bishop of Rome and Peters succeſſor, not head of all Churches nor vniuersall Bishop of al Bishops, but *Socius noſter*, our fellowe or companion, as one consenting with him in the vnitie of that Church, which was first planted by the Apostles, and not as a generall gouernor of the vniuersall Church of Christe. Wherefore although Optatus doe more thē was neceſſary vrge this argument of the vnitie of Peters Chaire, yet his meanining was not to set foorth an vnreprouable authoritie thereof, such as the Pope nowe challengeth, but onely to make it the beginning of vnitie.

At length he commeth to S. Hierome in an Epistle

to Damasus, out of whiche he gathereth diuers sentences. *Mihi cathedram &c.* *I thought it beste to aske counsel of the Chaire of Peter, & of the faith praysed by the mouth of the Apostle. I speake with the successor of a fisher, and with a disciple of the crosse. I following none first but Christe, am ioyned in communion with thy blessednesse, that is with the Chaire of Peter. Vpon that Rocke, I knowe the Church to be builded. Whosoeuer shall eate the Lambe out of this house he is vnholy. If any man be out of the Arke of Noe during the time of the Floude, hee shall perishe. I knowe not Vitalis, I despise Melitius, I haue no acquaintance with Paulinus, whosoeuer doth not gather with thee, he doth scatter abrode, that is, he that is not of Christe, is of Antichriste.* The conclusion openeth all the matter as longe as Damasus Byshop of Rome, gathereth with Christe, that is mayntaineth true doctrine, Hierome will gather with him, who professed before that he woulde followe none as first, but Christe. For he woulde not haue gathered with Liberius Byshoppe of Rome, whome hee confesseth to haue subscrybed to the Arians that were Heretikes in Catal. Script. eccles. What mockery is it then to drawe the commendations of a good Catholike Byshop maintaining true Doctrine, to euery Byshoppe sitting in that seate, agreeing neither in doctrine nor manners with that Christian predecessor.

Augustine must succeede Hierome, who in his 166. Epistle giueth vs this rule. *Cælestis magister. &c.* *The Heauenly maister maketh the people secure, concerning euil ouerseers, lest for their sakes the Chaire of healthfull doctrine shoulde be forsaken, in whiche Chaire euill men are euer constrayned to say good thinges, for the thinges whiche they speake are not their owne. But they are the thinges of God.*

Heere sayeth Maister Sander wee haue a Chaire of healthfull doctrine, and that is afterwarde called the Chaire of vnitie, therefore it is not the Chayre of euery Byshop, which are many, and of which many haue beene Heretikes, but the only chayre of the bi-

shop

shop of Rome, *in which Chaire the Pope be he neuer so euill, is constrayned to say good thinges and cannot erre*. But seeing I haue often proued that many Byshops sitting in that Chayre of Rome haue spoken euill thinges, and were sylthy Heretikes, it followeth, that this is not a wodden Chayre that Augustine speaketh of, but the Chayre of true doctrine, such as the Chayre of Moses was, in which not onely Aaron and his successors, but euen the Scrybes and Pharisees did sit, hauing the authoritie of Moses, while they vttered nothing but that which God deliuered by Moses. But when they preached false doctrine they did not sit in the chaire of Moses, but in the chayre of pestilence, as the Pope & all other heretikes doe. He talketh much of vnitie in S. Peter, in his chaire, seare and succession, as though any of these, were worth a straw, without vnitie in S. Peters doctrine, which was the doctrine of Christ.

But Sainct Augustine *Contr. epist. fundament.* confesseth that the succession of priestes from Saint Peter vnto this present time stayed him in the Catholike Church. It is true, he confesseth that this succession amonge many thinges was one that stayed him. And yet he acknowledgeth that the manifest trueth, *Præponenda est omnibus illis rebus quibus in Catholica teneor*, is to be preferred before all thinges by which I am stayed in the Catholike Church, namely before antiquitie, consent of nations, miracles, succession of Byshops and the name of Catholikes.

Likewise rehearsing the same things in a manner against the Donatistes which Maister Sander hath not omitted. Epist. 165. Hee sayeth, *Quamuis non tam de istis documentis præsumamus quam de Scripturis sanctis*. Although we presume not so much of these documents as of the holy spriptures. Wherefore as the argument of succession, was wel vsed against heretikes, so long as there was succession of doctrine with succession of persons: so now to alleadge the onely succession of persons where the doctrin is cleane changed, is as foolish & ridiculous,

as by ſhewing of emptie diſhes, to proue abundance of victuals, or ſhowing veſſels ful of filthy waters, to proue that they are full of good wine, becauſe meate of olde time, hath beene ſerued in ſuch diſhes, and wine preſerued in ſuch veſſels.

But if the authoritie of one man as Saint Auguſtine was, ſeeme little M. San. bringeth the two councels gathered in Africa & Numidia, againſt the Pelagiãs which ſent their decrees to the Sea of Rome, *That the authori- of the Apoſtolike Sea might be giuen to them.* Epi. 19. if they required the B. of Rome to agree with thẽ in the truth, what pretogatiue of ſupremacie do they graũt vnto him? Nay rather they do priuily reprehend him, that he had ſo long ſuffred the Pelagian poyſon to be ſpread vnder his noſe in Europe, and the doctriue neither called to examination, nor confuted, yea rather ſeemed to cõſent to the den of the biſhops of the Eaſt, that Pelagius was iuſtly abſolued. But Pope Innocentius himſelfe praiſeth them Ep. 91. that they had kept the cuſtoms of the olde tradition, in referring the matter to his Sea and ſayth, *That the fathers not by humaine but by diuine ſentence haue decreed that what ſoeuer was done in the prouinces a farre of, they ſhould not account it before to be ended, except it came to the knowledge of this ſea, where whatſoeuer had beene iuſtly pronounced ſhould be confirmed by the authoritie of this ſea, and thoſe other churches ſhould take it as it were waters which ſhould flow from their owne native fountain.* We know the ambitious Ep. of Innocentius if it be not counterfeted, becauſe many patches therof are found in other decretal epiſtles: but we deny that ỹ authoritie which he pretended, was acknowledged by theſe two councels, yes ſaith M. S. the fathers of the Mileuitan councel ſay: *Arbitramur &c. We think theſe men that haue ſo pernitious and froward opinions will giue place more eaſily to the authority of your holines, beeing taken out of the authoritie of the holy Scriptures, by help of the mercy of our lord Ieſus Chriſt which vouchſafeth to rule you when you conſult & to heare you whẽ you pray.* by theſe words they ſhew, that they hope ỹ here

tikes

tikes being reproued by the B. of Rome out of the word of God, wil the rather giue place, wout imagining, that the B. of Romes authoritie is so stablished by the scriptures that whatsoeuer he decre cõtrary to the scriptures the same should be imbraced. But a farther confirmatiõ of the epistle of Innoce. he bringeih out of Aug. Ep. 106. Where he saith, *Pope Innocent did write an answere to the Bishops in al things, as it became the prelate of the Apostolike sea.* But these words neither proue that epistle to be written by Innocent, nor if it were, do allowe his pretended auth ority, because that was no matter whereof they required his answere. But to put it out of dout. Both these Councels haue decreed against the vsurpation of the Romish sea. As the counceel Mileuitan cap. 22. decreed that no man should appeele out of Africa, vnder paine of excommunication.

The laste authoritie cited out of Augustine, is, Epistle 162. speaking of the Churche of Rome. *In qua semper Apostolicæ cathedræ viguit principatus.* In which alwayes the principalitie of the Apostolike chaire hath flouriished. A matter often confessed that the fathers especially of the later times since Constantine aduanced the Church in wealth & dignitie, esteemed the church of Rome as the principall Sea in dignitie, but not in absolute authoritie, such as in processe of time the Byshops of Rome claymed and vsurped. For euen the same Augustine with 216. Bishops refused to yeelde to the Bishop of Rome, clayming by a counterfaite Canon of the Councell of Nice, to haue authortie to receaue appeales out of Africa. Epi. con. Aphr. ad Bonifac. whiche they couupte an intollerable pride and presumption, and in Epist. cont. Aphri. *ad Cælestinum fumosum typum seculi.* A smokey pride of the worlde which the Pope claymed and an absurde authoritie, that one mã should be better able to examine such causes, then so many Byshops, of the prouince where the controuersie began, and by the olde Cannons shoulde be ended.

To Auguſtine he ioyneth Proſper Biſhop of Rhegiũ in Italie which affirmeth in *lib de ingrat.that Rome the ſee of Peter was the firſt that did cut of the peſtilence of Pelagius, which Rome being made head vnto the worlde of paſtorall honor holdeth by religion whatſoeuer it doth not poſſeſſe by warre.* And againe. *Rome through the primacie of the Apoſtolike Prieſthoode, is made greater by the caſtell of religion, then by the throne of power.* Firſt how vntruly he boaſteth that the ſee of Peter, was the firſt that did cut of the hereſie of Pelagius you may eaſe y ſee, by that the councel of Africa did before condemne it, & had ſomwhat a doe to perſwade Innocentius Biſhop of Rome to it. Whereby you ſee, that Proſper was ouer partiall to the ſee of Rome, to whome yet he aſcribeth a principallity or primacy of honor, not of power or auctority.

The teſtimonies of Leo & Gregory B ſhops of Rome as alwaies, ſo now I deeme to be vnmeete to be heard in their owne cauſe, though otherwiſe they were not the worſt men, yet great furtherers of the auctoritie of Antichriſt, which ſoone after their dayes, tooke poſſeſſiõ of the chaire, which they had helped to prepare for him. The laſt teſtimonie out of Beda which liued vnder the tyranny of Antichriſt, I will not ſtande vpon, M. Sander may haue great ſtore of ſuch late writers to affirme the Popes ſupremacie.

The 16. Chapter.

Sander. *THat the good Chriſtian Emperours and Princes, did neuer thinke thẽ ſelues to be the ſupreame heads of the church in ſpirituall cauſes, but gaue that honor to Biſhops, & Prieſts, & moſt ſpecially to the ſea of Rome for S. Peters ſake, as well before, as after the time of Phocas. A Prieſt is aboue the Emperour in Eccleſiaſtical cauſes. The othe of the royal ſupremacy, is intollerable. Conſtantine was baptiſed at Rome. Phocas did not firſt make the ſee of Rome head of all churches.*

Fulke. COncerning the ſupremacy of our ſoueraigne, which this traiterous Papiſt doth ſo maliciouſly diſdaine, although

although it be expounded sufficiently by her Maiestie in her iniunction, not to be suche as he most slaunderously doth deforme it, yet I will here, as I haue done diuerse times before in aunswere to these Papistes, professe, that we ascribe no supremacie to our Prince, but such as the worde of God alloweth in the godly Kinges of the old Testament, and the church hath acknowledged in the Christian Emperours and Princes vnder the new Testament.

First therefore we ascribe to our Prince no absolute power, in any Ecclesiasticall causes, suche as the Pope challengeth, but subiect vnto the rules of Gods worde. Secondly we ascribe no supremacie of knowledge in Ecclesiastical matters to our Prince, but affirme that she is to learne of the Bishops and teachers of the church, both in matters of faith and of the gouernment of the church. Thirdly we allow no confusion of callings, that the Prince should presume to preach, to minister the Sacramentes, to excommunicate, &c. which perteine not to her office. But the supremacie we admit in Ecclesiasticall causes, is auctoritie ouer all persons to cõmaund, and by lawes to prouide, that all matters Ecclesiasticall, may be ordered and executed according to the word of God. And such is the true meaning of the othe, that he calleth blasphemous and intollerable. And as for examples of honor geuen to the Bishoppes by Christian Princes, which he bringeth forth, they deny not this supremacy, nor make any thing against it.

The first is of the Emperour Philippus, counted of some for the first Christian Emperor, although it be not like to be true, yet admitting the story written by Eusebius to be so. This Prince without due repentance, offered him selfe to receaue the holy misteries, & being refused by the Bishop of the place, tooke it paciẽtly, & submitted him selfe to the discipline & order of ỹ church. I answer, this example toucheth not the auctority he had in ecclesiasticall causes. For in receauing of the Sacramentes, the Prince differeth not from a priuate person.

But he puſheth at M. Nowell with a two horned argument, called a dilemma. If the Prieſt in theſe cauſes, be ſuperior to ỹ Emperor, other cauſes be greater or leſſer then theſe. If they be greater, the Emperour which is not ſupreame gouernor ouer the leſſer cauſes, can not be in the greater, if they be leſſer, then the Prieſt ẅ gouerneth the Emperor, in greater cauſes, muſt nedes gouern him in leſſer cauſes. Theſe hornes are eaſily auoyded not by diſtinctiõ of the cauſes, but of the gouernments. The gouernment of the Prince is one, & of the Prieſt an other: this ſpiritual, the other external, & therefore no contrariety betwene them. For put the caſe, that Philippus had ſeene the Biſhop prophane the ſacrament, in miniſtring to infidels, or otherwiſe vncertainly behauing him ſelfe in his office, might he not iuſtly haue puniſhed him, as ſupreame gouernour ouer the Biſhoppe euen in thoſe matters? I ſay not to doe them, but to ſee that they be well done, and to puniſhe the offendors. Neither is the meaning of the othe any other. And according to this meaning, M. Nowell, M. Horne and M. Iewel dare warrant the King to be ſupreame gouernour in all Eccleſiaſticall cauſes, although it pleaſe M. Sander to ſay, the contrarie of them. Whoſe trayterous quarelling vpon the wordes of the othe, ought not to trouble any mans cõſcience, when the meaning is publikelie teſtified both by the Prince, and by the whole conſent of the church.

The next exãple is of Conſtantinus the great, which in the Synode of Nice, when the Biſhops had offered vnto him bills of complaint, one againſt an other, without diſcloſing the contentes of them, he ſayd, as Ruffinus reporteth *lib.* 10. *cap.* 2. *Deus vos conſtituit ſacerdotes &c. God hath made you Prieſtes, and hath giuen you power to iudge of vs alſo, and therfore we are rightly iudged of you, but ye can not be iudged of mẽ. For which cauſe, expect ye the iudgement of God alone among ye.* Here M. Sander noteth, firſt, that he calleth them Prieſtes, whereby he woulde proue, they had power to offer externall ſacrifice, which is a ſimple reaſon, for then all Chriſtian men & women

within

within the Scripture are called Prieſtes, haue the ſame power. Secondly he cõfeſſeth, they haue power to iudge the Emperour, for none can be greater then a Prieſt: In their challenge and ſpirituall gouernment, the Emperour meaneth, and not as the Popiſh church practiſed, to diſpoſe the Emperour. Thirdly, that Prieſtes can not be iudged of mẽ. If this be ſo, one Prieſt can not be iudged of an other, and where is then the Popes ſupremacie, but he aunſwereth, if one Prieſt iudge an other, it is Gods iudgement, and not the iudgement of men, becauſe God hath ſet one Prieſt aboue another. O blockiſh aunſwere: as though God hath not ſet one Prince aboue all his ſubiectes. You ſee howe Popiſh Prieſtes aduaunce them ſelues, to the honor of God, and withdraw their obedience from Gods Lieutenaunts on earth. An vndoubted note of Antichriſtians. You will aſke me then, what ſence theſe wordes haue, you can not be iudged of men? I aunſwere either they are ment, as Sainct Paule ſpeaketh, of the vprightnes of his conſcience in doing of his office, which is not ſubiect to the iudgement of men, or elſe Ruffinus as he was a bolde reporter, frameth the Emperours wordes, according to that eſtimation which he woulde haue men to haue of the clergie. For it is certeyne by recordes of Conſtantinus time, that he did iudge Biſhoppes and tooke vpon him as ſupreame gouernour in eccleſiaſticall cauſes, Maiſter Sander confeſſeth, he iudged certeyne Prieſts, or eccleſiaſticall cauſes, but he did it as Auguſtine ſayeth, *Epiſt. 162. as one that would afterward aſke pardon of the holy Biſhops*, at the importunitie of the Donatiſts: And as Optatus recordeth he ſayd, *De ſchiſ. lib. 1. Petitis à me &c. Ye aſke of me iudgement in the world, whereas I my ſelfe looke for Chriſtes iudgement.* And Auguſtine reproueth the Donatiſtes *that they would haue an earthly King to be iudge of their cauſe.* In deede the importunitie of the Donatiſtes was wicked who would ſo referre the matter to the Emperour, ỳ without knowledge of eccleſiaſticall perſons, who were only meete iudges in reſpect of knowledge in

that caſe, they would haue ỹ cauſe decided. But the Emperour acknowledging his auctoritie appointed iudges eccleſiaſtical perſons, firſt the Biſhop of Rome Melchiades, whom he commaũded with other Biſhops to heare the cauſe of Cæcilianus, as Euſebius who liued in his time writeth *li.* 10. *ca.* 5. And whẽ the Donatiſts appealed from the Biſhops of Rome & his cõpanions iudgement, he appointed other delegates, as Auguſtine alſo witneſſeth. *Ep.* 162.

But to leaue this cauſe of the Donatiſtes Euſebius « in his life *libr.* 1. ſayeth of him: *Quoniam nonnulli va-* « *rijs locis inter ſe diſcrepabant, quaſi communis quidem Epiſco-* « *pus à Deo conſtitutus, miniſtrorum Dei ſynodos conuocauit, nec* « *dedignatus eſt adeſſe, & conſidere in illorum medio.* Becauſe « ſome of them in diuerſe places were at variance among « them ſelues, he as a certeine generall Biſhop appointed « of God, called together the ſynodes of the miniſters of « God, and diſdayned not to be preſent, and to ſit in the « middeſt of them. And in *lib.* 3. He ſheweth howe he gathered the vniuerſall ſynode of Nice, as it were leading foorth the armie of God to battell. To this Emperour did Athanaſius the great, Biſhoppe of Alexandria, appeale from the ſynode of Tyre, where he was iniuriouſly handled, as both Socrates teſtifieth *lib.* 1. and the verie Epiſtle of Conſtantine him ſelfe vnto that ſynode, commaunding all the Biſhoppes to come vnto his pre- « ſence, and there to ſhewe before him. (*quem ſyncerum* « *eſſe Dei miniſtrum neque vos ſanè negabitis*, whome you « can not deny to be a ſyncere miniſter of God) how ſincerely they had iudged in that councell. Finally in the end of the epiſtle he proteſteth, that he wil execute his « ſupremacie in cauſes eccleſiaſtical. *Omni virtute conabor* « *agere quatenus quæ in lege Dei ſunt ea præcipuè ſine aliqua* « *turbatione ſeruentur quibus vtiq, neq, vituperatio neq, mala* « *ſuperſtitio poterit implicari diſperſis vtiq, ac palam contritis,* « *& penitus exterminatis ſacratiſſimæ legis inimicis, qui ſub* « *ſchemate ſancti nominis blaſphemas varias ad diuerſos inji-* « *ciant.* I will endeuour with all my might to bringe to paſſe

passe, that those thinges that are in the lawe of God, » those chiefly without any staggering may be obserued, » which by no reproofe or euill superstition can be intan- » gled, when all the enemyes of the moste holye lawe, » which vnder a shape of an holy name, doe cast out di- » uerse blasphemies vnto sondry persons, are dispersed & » openly troden downe, and vtterly rooted out. Let this » suffice to shewe what supremacie Constantinus did exercise in causes Ecclesiasticall. Nowe Maister Sander draweth vs to see, what honour he gaue to the see of Rome.

First he taketh it for most certayne, that Constantine was baptised by Syluester, which is an impudent lye and forged fable, as is manifest by Eusebius, who liued in his tyme and after him, who knewe him familiarly, and affirmeth that he was baptised in his iorney towardes Iordane, where he had purposed to haue bene baptised, if God had spared him life. But this manifest testimonye of Eusebius, Maister Sander refuseth, becau'e he was suspected for affection to the Arrian heresie. Beside that he was vniustly suspected, what reason is it, to discredit his story, who wrote at such tyme, as many thousands aliue could disproue him, for any affection to that heresie, whereto the baptisme of Constantine pertayned nothinge in the worlde? As for the stones and pillers of marble, in which any such matter is grauen, bearing the name of his baptistry except Maister Sander could proue, that they were sette vppe in his tyme, are simple witnesses against the historye of Eusebius, which lyued in his tyme. Nether the forged pontificall of Damasus, nor the writings of Beda, Ado, Marianus, Gregorius Turenésis, Zonarus, Nicephorus late writers, following the fable of the Romish Church, are of any credit in respect of Eusebius, and the eldest writers of the Ecclesiasticall story, that agree with Eusebius that he was not baptised many yeares after Syluester was deade.

And concerning the donation of Constantine, it is

too absurd for any wise man to defend, which hath bene so long before disproued by Laurentius Valla, no enemy of the Romish religion, although a discouerer of that fable. Agayne his forsaking of the citie of Rome, and building of Constantinople, is as great a fable, for although he bewtified Byzantium, and made it an imperiall citye, as placed conueniently to keepe the Orientall Empire, yet he forsooke not Rome, but still retayned it as the chiefe see of his Empire, so did the Emperours that followed him, vntill (after it was wasted by the barbarous nations,) they made lesse accompt of it. And therefore although Constans the Nephew of Heraclius could not conueniently remoue thether, yet he remoued frõ thence what he thought good, by which it appeared he had authoritie in the citie, by the prouidence of God and not by chaunce, as M. Sander dreameth, that he was prohibited by Gods prouidence in respect of the Popes supremacie, or els the world should be gouerned by chaunce.

But leauing Constantinus the father, we must come to Constantius his sonne which was an Arrian, of whom Athanasius complayneth, that he had no reuerence of the Bishop of Rome *Ep. ad Solit. vit. agen.* nether considering *that it was an Apostolike see, nor that Rome was the mother citie of the Romane Empire*. There were other Apostolikes sees beside Rome, and the Christian worlde was larger then the Romane Empire, therefore this maketh nothing for the singular prerogatiue of that see.

But the noble Emperours Gratianus, Valentinianus & Theodosius made a law, *lege 1. Cod. de summa trinit. That all their people should continue in that religion, as the religion which is vsed from S. Peter vnto this day doth declare him to haue deliuered to the Romanes, and which it is euident that Bishop Damasus doth follow, and Peter Bishop of Alexandria a man of Apostolike holines.* This law proueth, that the Emperours had authoritie in Ecclesiasticall causes. And that they ioyned the Patriarch of Rome with the Patriarch of Alexandria, not because he of Alexandria agre-

ed

ed with him of Rome, but because they both agreed with Peter, and Peter with Christ.

From these Emperours, he commeth to Bonifacius, who writing to the Emperour Honorius, and humbly desiring his ayde to appease the tumults of his Church, vseth these wordes. *Ecclesiæ meæ cui Deus noster meum sacerdotiũ (vobis res humanas regentibus) deputauit, cura constringit, ne causis eius quamuis adhuc corporis incommoditate detinear, propter conuentus qui à sacerdotibus vniuersis, & clericis, & Christianæ plebis perturbationibus agitantur, apud aures Christianissimi principis desim.* The care of my church to which our God hath deputed my priesthood, while you gouerne the affayres of men, doth bind me, that although I am yet withholden by infirmitie of bodye, I should not be wanting to the causes thereof in the hearing of a most Christian Prince, by reason of the meetings that are held of all the Priestes and the Clergie with the perturbations of the Christian people. These words shewe, that the Emperour was supreame gouernour in causes Ecclesiasticall, for he writeth concerning the election of the Bishop. To whom the Emperour answereth making a lawe against the ambitious labouring for succession, that if two Bishops should be chosen, they should be both banished out of the citie. *Con. To. 1. & dist.* 97. I haue set downe the wordes at large to shewe the shamefull falsification of M. Sander, who setteth them downe absolutely thus. *Mihi Deus noster meum sacerdotium vobis res humanas regẽtibus deputauit.* Our God hath appoynted my priesthood to me, whereas you doe gouerne worldly matters. As though he had denied to the Emperour, all gouernment in Ecclesiasticall causes, whẽ he flyeth to his authoritie in a cause Ecclesiasticall, and doth not onely acknowledge him to be a conseruer of ciuill peace, as M. Sander would haue it.

To Honorius he ioyneth *Galla Placidia* the Empereresse in her epistle to Theodosius, set before the councell of Chalcedon, *Affirming that Peter ordayned the primacy of the Bishoply office in the see Apostolike.* Thus wrote

the Empereſſe or her Secretary, and ſo it was taken in that time. The like ſayth Valentinianus in his Epiſtle to Theodoſius his father, *that antiquitie gaue the chiefty of prieſtly power to the Biſhop of the citie of Rome.* And Martianus with Valentinian confeſſe that the Synode of Chalcedon *inquired of the faith by the authoritie of Leo Biſhop of the euerlaſting citie of Rome*. Adde hereunto that the councell it ſelfe confeſſeth *Act. 3. that Leo was ouer them as the head ouer the members*. All theſe proue in deede a primacy of the Biſhop of Rome acknowledged in thoſe dayes, but not ſuch a primacye as is now claymed. For the ſame councell and Emperours decreed that the ſee of Conſtantinople in the Eaſt ſhould haue the ſame authoritie that the ſee of Rome had in the Weſt, the title of ſenioritie onely reſerued to the Biſhop of Rome. Although the Biſhop of Rome, Leo by letters and his legats in the councell cryed out againſt it as lowd as they could. *Conc. Chal act. 16.* namely Lucentius cryed. *Sedes Apoſtolica &c*, The Apoſtolike ſea ought not to be abaſed in our preſence &c. but all the ſynode and the Iudges continued in their decree.

The ſaying of Iuſtinian *in cod. de ſumm. trinit.* is examined and aunſwered in the 69. article of M. Sanders treatiſe which is the true Church, before his booke of Images, as alſo the ſayings of the Biſhop of Patara, of Eugenius Biſhop of Carthage, and Gregory Biſhop of Rome. The report of the councell of Sinueſſa is too full of corruption and confuſion to be credited for authenticall authoritie.

And yet it is playne that Marcellinus the Biſhop of Rome was conuicted by witneſſes to haue committed Idolatry, before he confeſſed the ſinne, and receiued ſentence of condemnation and accurſing of the Synode, howſoeuer that patche is thruſt in after the Actes of the councell, *prima ſedes, &c. the firſt ſee is not iudged of any*, which in euery counterfait decretall epiſtle almoſt muſt haue a place.

To proue that Phocas did not firſt make the ſee of Rome

Rome heade of all Churches, when the history is plaine he did, M. Sander bringeth in these and such like alledged before, which acknowledged a certaine primacie of the see of Rome. And certaine it is the Bishops of Rome before Phocas tyme, affected a great primacie, which of many was acknowledged, but yet neuer absolutely, neuer without cõtrouersie, vntil Phocas for a great summe of money receyued of Boniface the thirde, strake the stroke, and made the decree, for which in all popish writers he is highly praised: although in the Greeke church his decree was not long obserued. Touching the examples of Emperours and Princes of later times, although I could shewe they haue often resisted the Pope, yet I know many may be alledged that haue submitted themselues to his Antichristian tyranny, which I will not stãd to examine, because they can be no preiudice to the truth approued by examples of the eldest age. As for the history of Lucius king of Britayne, that sent to Eleutherius for preachers, if it were true, it maketh nothinge for the supremacy of the romish Bishop. I will therefore conclude this chapter, with a saying of Socrates *in proe. lib.* 5. to shew what authoritie he iudged themperours to haue in Eccleſiasticall matters. *Et ipſos quidem Imperatores hac hiſtoria continua complectimur, propterea quod ab illis poſtquam Chriſtiani eſſe cæperunt, res Eccleſiaſticæ pendent, & maximæ Synodi ex illorum ſententia & congregatæ ſunt & congreganur.* And in this continuall history we comprehend the Emperours themselues, because that vpon them, since they began to be Christians, the matters of the Church depend, and the greatest synods haue bene gathered & are gathered by their authoritie. The punishment he threatneth to them that forsake the Church of Rome, shal one day fall vpon them that take part with ỹ Church of Rome, as in part it doth already.

The 17. chapter.

Their doctrine who teach the Bishop of Rome to be Anti- Sander.

christ him selfe is confuted by the authoritie of Gods worde, and by the consent of auncient fathers. Why Antichrist is permitted to come.

Fulke. AFter he hath shewed his opinion, what maner a one Antechrist shalbe, & alleaged ỳ cause of his cõming out of S. Paul 2. *Thes.* 2. because men haue not receaued the loue of the truth, that they might be saued, God shal sende thẽ the working of error, ỳ they may beleue lying, &c. he stormeth out of measure against the Protestants, for that they can find no place to setle Antichrist in, but in the see of Rome, so beautified & dignified by Christ, and all the primitiue Church: But seeing Antichrist is appoynted to sit in the temple of God, which is a higher place then S. Peters chayer, it is no meruayle if Satan haue thrust him into that see, which of olde tyme was accompted the toppe and castell of all religion.

But let vs see his reasons taken out of Gods word, by which it is proued, that the Pope can not be Antichrist him selfe. The first is, because in S. Paule he is called ὁ ἀνθρωπος &c. the man of sinne which signifieth one singular man, and not a number of men in succession, and this is affirmed to be the Greeke article in this worde man, by Cyrillus in *Ioan. lib.* 1. *cap.* 4. But how frendly Cyrillus was deceaued, you shall see, by some examples, euen out of the new Testament. In S. Mathew *cap.* 12. 35. you haue; ἀγαθος ἀνθρωπος & ỳ ὁ πονηρος ἀνθρωπος. A good man out of the good treasure of his heart, and an euill man out of the euil treasure of his heart bringeth &c. where no one singular man is ment.

In S. Mark cap. 2. verse. 27. The Sabboth was made διὰ τὸν ἀνθρωπον ỳ ὁ ἀνθρωπος for man & not man for the Sabboth. In S. Luke cap. 4. verse. 4. Not with breade onely ὁ ἀνθρωπος a man shall liue, but by euery woorde of God. S. Paule. 2. Tim. 3. ver. 17. That the man of God ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀνθρωπος may be perfect and prepared to euery good woorke. These places and an hundreth more which might bee brought, doe proue, howe vaine the argu-

argument is thatis taken of the nature of the Greke article. Nether is Hierom or any of the auncient writers to be heard without authoritie of the Scripture, which supposed that Antichrist should be one man. Although none of them directly affirmeth that he should be one man, as Christ was. Hierom *in Dani. cap.* 7. sayth we must not thinke that Antichrist should be a Deuill, *but one of the kind of men in whom Satan should dwell*. This proueth not that he should be a singular man, no more then the fourth beast, which signifieth the Romãe Empire, out of which he should rise, should be one singular Emperour. No more doth it proue that becausse Antiochus was a figure of him, he must be but one man. And as litle that Ambrose *in* 2. *The.* 2, sayth, *Satan shall appeare in homine, in a man*, which may signify the kind of men and not one singular person. Likewise Augustine calling Antichrist the Prince, and last Antichrist, meaneth no one person for the words Prince and last, may agree to a whole succession of men in one state, as well as the wordes king and beaste, to a whole succession of Emperours in Daniel. To conclude, there is not one whome he nameth, that denyeth Antichrist to be a whole succession of mẽ, in one state of deuilish gouernment. And Irenæus thinketh it probable of the Romane kingdom, *lib.* 5.

The second argument is, that Antichrist is called the aduersary, & therefore is the greatest enemy of Christ, *denying Iesus Christ to be God and man, or to be our Mediatour*. I aunswer, the Pope doth so, denying the office of Christ, although with the deuills, he confesse in wordes, Iesus to be the holy one of God, and to be Christ the sonne of God. *Marke* 1. 24. *Luke.* 4. 41. his diuinitie the Pope denieth, by denying his onely power in sauing, his wisedom in his word to be onely sufficient, his goodnes in the vertue of his death to take away both payne and guylt of sinne, which he arrogateth to him selfe by his blasphemous pardons. Christes humanitie he denyeth by his transsubstantiation, his mediation, in which he is principally Christ, he denyeth by so many meanes of

ſaluation as he maketh, beſide Chriſt *videlicet* mans merits, ceremonies inuented by man, pardons, a newe ſacrifice of the Maſſe, &c.

The third argumẽt is, that Antichriſt ſhall not come, before the Romane Empire be cleane taken away. For that which Saint Paule ſayth, *ye knowe what withholdeth, &c.* Although it be not neceſſary to expound this of the Romane Empire, yet following the olde writers that ſo vnderſtood it, I ſay the Romane Empire was remoued before Antichriſt the Pope was throughly enſtalled. For beſide that the ſee of the Empire was remoued from Rome, the gouernment it ſelfe was in a manner cleane remoued, the title of the Romane Emperour onely remayning, at laſt an other Empire by the Pope was erected in Germanye, whereof litle beſide a name remayneth at this day, the Pope clayming authoritie of both the ſwordes, and he that is the Emperour in title, if he haue no landes of his owne inheritance, ſcarſe equall with a Duke by dominion of his Empire.

The fourth argument is, that the deedes & doctrine of Antichriſt againſt Chriſt, muſt be open and without all diſſimulation, becauſe Saint Paule maketh a differẽce betwene the myſterye of iniquitie, and the open ſhewing of Antichriſt. I aunſwer, they are open to all faithfull Chriſtians, although they be hidde from ſuch as be deceiued by Antichriſt. Here M. Sander aunſwereth to that which he ſuppoſeth might be obiected, that ſome gloſes of ỹ canon law, call the Pope God, or make him equall with Chriſt, yea they call him God aboue all Gods: but he thinketh to auoyd it by ſaying, they call him not God by nature, but by office vnder Chriſt, where they ſay he is equall with Chriſt. This blaſphemy will not ſo eaſily be excuſed. Nether is it to be thought that any man will euer cal him ſelfe God by nature. But to omitte theſe flattering gloſes of the canon lawe, doth not the Pope exalt him ſelf aboue all that is called God and worſhipped as God. When he commaundeth to abſtayne from meates and mariage, whereof God hath created

created the one and instituted the other, as good and holy, for greater goodnes and holines then God created or instituted in them. Doth he not exalt him selfe aboue God the redeemer, when he affirmeth his redéption to be, ether onely from sinnes committed before baptisme, or onely from the guilt of sin whereas his popish pardons can absolue from both. Doth he not extoll him selfe aboue God the holy Ghost, when he taketh vpon him to sanctifie the creatures of the world, otherwise then God hath sanctified them to apply the merits of Christ, otherwise then Gods holy spirite worketh application by faith, &c.

The 5. argument is, that Antichrist should be receyued moste speciallye of the Iewes, of which hee bringeth the opinion of diuerse olde writers, but because the Scripture sayth no such thinge, but contrary that he shall sit in the Church of God. We deny the antecedent or proposition of this argument. But M. S. alledgeth the saying of Christ *Ioan. 5. I came in my fathers name, and ye haue not receyued me, if another come in his owne name ye wil receyue him.* This other man sayth M.S. is Antichrist, and so expounded by the auncient fathers. I aunswer they haue no ground of this exposition. For Theudas the Egyptian, Cocabas, and such like, deceyued the Iewes in their owne name, yet none of them was this Antichrist.

The 6. argument is, that Antichrist according to the prophecy of Daniel *cap. 7.* & the interpretation of Hierom, shal subdue 3. kings, the kings of Egypt, Africa, and Ethiopia, which seeing the Pope hath not done, he is not Antichrist, I aunswer, Nether Hierom nor any Ecclesiastical writer, whom he followeth, hath any direction out of the Scripture, for this interpretation, wherefore it is more like, that the Emperour is the litle horne which first diminishing as it were a thirde parte of the strength of the fourth beast, at length began vtterly to oppresse & destroy it, I meane ỹ cõmon welth of Rome.

The 7. reason is, *Antichrist shal prenaile in his raigne but 3. yeares & an halfe, Dan 7. which time the Apocalyse calleth*

42.*monethes*.I aunſwer,this tyme muſt not be limited by meaſure of man,but as God hath appoynted it. Daniell nameth no yeres,but a tyme,tymes,& halfe a tyme.And Hierom in his accompt of 1293 daies differeth from S. Iohn *Apoc*.12.6.who ſetteth them downe 1260. dayes.

The 8.reaſon is,*that Helias ſhall come at the tyme of Antichriſt,as Hippolitus,Auguſtine,Hierom & Theodoret teach, who is not yet come,although the Pope haue long floriſhed*. I aunſwer,The Scripture ſpeaketh of no comming of Helias,but of Chriſtes two witneſſes,which haue neuer failed in the greateſt heate of the popiſh tyranny. *Apoc*.11.

The 9.reaſon is, that *Antichriſt ſhall be of the tribe of Dan, by the opinion of Irenæus,Hippolitus,Theodoretus,and Gregory,whereas the Popes are of no ſuch tribe*. I aunſwer, the Scripture hath not reuealed any ſuch matter,nether doth Irenæus reſt vpon that opinion, but iudgeth he may well be the king of the Romane Empire,ſaying very wiſely.*Certius ergo & ſine periculo eſt ſuſtinere adimpletionem prophetiæ,quam ſuſpicari. &c*. Therefore it is more certayne and without daunger, to tary the fulfilling of the prophecy,then to ſurmiſe &c.Againe if this opinion ſhould be true, he ſhoulde not riſe out of the Romane Empire,as all olde writers haue conſented he muſt, according to the prophecye.

The 10.argument is,that *Antichriſt ſhall not come before the later ende of the world,as Auguſtine and Theodoretus iudged*. but Gregory ſeeing the ambition of Iohn of Conſtantinople affirmed, that the tyme of the reuelation of Antichriſt was euen at hand, and that the ſame Iohn was the forerunner of Antichriſt, and Antichriſt ſhould ſhortly be reuealed,& an army of Prieſts ſhould waite vpon him.Nowe ſeeing he, whoſoeuer tooke that which Iohn refuſed,by Gregories iudgement ſhould be Antichriſt,and it is certayne, that Pope Boniface the 3. ſoone after the death of Gregory and his ſucceſſors, vſurped not onely that, but more alſo, it is certayne by Gregoryes prophecye,that the Pope is Antichriſt.Who being within the 600.yeares, aunſwereth to M. Sanders

fonde

fonde chalenge. And although none within that compaſſe had pointed out the ſee of Rome, yet the fulfilling of the prophecye in the later tymes, did ſufficiently declare who it ſhould be. And moſt of the auncient writers name Rome to be the ſee of Antichriſt. Although they could not foreſee that the Biſhoprike of that ſee ſhould degenerate into the tyrannye of Antichriſt. M. Sander aunſwereth, that Tertullian and Hierom, call Rome Babylon, *becauſe of the confuſion of tongues of diuerſe nations, that haũted thether in tyme of the Emperours. And the Rome was full of Idolatry, and did perſecute the Saincts and namely more then 30. Biſhops of Rome.* The reaſon of tongues is very abſurd, and not giuen by any of thoſe writers. As for Idolatrie and perſecuting of Saincts, although it might be ſayd in tyme of Irenæus, and Tertullian, yet could it not be ſayd in the dayes of Hierom, Auguſtine, Ambroſe, Primaſius, and a number that liued in time of the Chriſtian Emperours. And whereas Hierom *ad Algaſiam*, expoundeth the name of blaſphemye written in the foreheade of the purple harlet to be Rome euerlaſting, it agreeth very well vnto the ſee of the Popedom, which they boaſt to be eternall, although the Empire of Rome ſhall be cleane taken away. For M. Sander him ſelfe liketh well the title giuen by Martianus and Valentinianus to Leo, whome they call Biſhop of the euerlaſting citie of Rome. cap. 16.

But whereas Rome is the citie builded vpon ſeuen hills, ſpoken of in the Apocalypſe *cap* 17. M. Sander coũteth it a childiſhe argument, to proue the ſee of Antichriſt to be there, *for that the citie is nowe gone from the hills, and ſtandeth in the playne of Campus Martius, and the Pope ſitteth on the other ſide of the riuer, vpon the hill Vatican harde by Saint Peters Churche, by whome he holdeth his chayre, not at all deriuing his power from the ſeuen hills, &c.* But if the Pope ſitte now in an other Rome, then Peter the Apoſtle ſatte, howe will Maiſter Sander perſwade vs, that he ſitteth in the chayre of Peter. For that Rome where Peter ſatte, was buylded vpon ſeuen

Hilles, and not gone downe into the plaine of Campus Martius, nor ouer the Riuer. Beſide this it is plaine, that although the people haue remoued their habitations from the hilles, yet the Pope hath not, for on them be ſtill to this day his Churches, Monaſteryes, & courtes. For on the Mounte Cælius be the monaſtery of Sainte Gregory, the church of Iohn and Paule, the Hoſpitall of our Sauiour, the rounde Church, the great Minſter of Laterane, in which are ſayde, to be the heades of the Apoſiles Peter and Paule, and the goodlyeſt buildings in the worlde, where the Byſhops of Rome dwelled vntill the time of Nicolas the ſeconde, which was almoſt eleuen hundreth yeeres after Chriſte.

The Mount Auentinus, hath three Monaſteryes, of Sabina Bonifacius, and Alexius.

The Mount Exquilinus, hath the Church of Sainćte Peter himſelfe ſurnamed *Ad vincula.*

The Mounte Viminalis hath the Church of S. Laurence in Paliſperna, and S. Potentiana.

The Mount Tarpeius or Capitoline, hath an houſe of Fryers Minors called *Ara Cæli.* And there did Boniface the ninth builde a fayre houſe of Bricke for keeping of Courtes.

The Mount Palatinus is a place called the great Pallace, and hath an olde Church of S. Nicolas and of S. Andrewe.

The Mounte Quirinalis is not altogither voide of habitation, to which appertaineth the Churche of S. Maria de populo.

The citie with 7. hils is ſtil the ſee of Antichriſt, deſcribed by S. Iohn at ſuch time as thoſe 7. hills were moſt of al inhabited & garniſhed with ſumptuous buildings. But M.S. to darken the propheſie ſaith, *Thoſe 7. hilles be the fulnes of pride in ſecular princes, to whome the Proteſtantes commit the ſupreme gouernment of the church.* I will not ſpeake of this contumely that hee bloweth out againſt chriſtian Princes, neither wil I, ſtād to proue that 7. hills in that place are taken literally, which is an eaſy matter becauſe

becauſe 7. hilles are the expoſition of 7. heads of ỹ beaſt, but how wil M.S or all the Papiſts in the world deny the citie of Rome to be that Babylon and ſee of Antichriſt, When the Angel in the laſt verſe of the chapter ſayth, And the woman which thou ſaweſt is that great citie which hath dominiõ ouer the Kings of the earth: which if any man ſay was any other Citie then Rome, all learning and learned men wil cry out againſt him. The ſee beeing found, it is eaſy to finde the perſon by S. Paules deſcription, and this note eſpecially that excludeth the heathen tyrants, he ſhal ſit in the temple of God, which when when we ſee to be fulfilled in the Pope, although none of the eldeſt fathers could ſee it, becauſe it was performed after their death, we nothing doubt to ſay & affirme ſtil, that the Pope is that man of ſinne & Sonne of perdition, the aduerſary that lifteth vp himſelfe aboue all that is called God, and ſhalbe deſtroyed by the ſpirit of the Lords mouth, & by the glory of his cõming.

The 18. Chapter.

NOT the Pope of Rome, but the Proteſtants themſelues are the members of Antichriſte, by forſaking the Catholike Church, by ſetting vppe a newe Church and by teaching falſe doctrine againſt the Goſpell of Ieſus Chriſte. Heretikes departe from the Catholike Churche. Heretikes beeing once departed out of the Church, haue newe names. VVhy among the Catholikes ſome are called Franciſcanes, Dominicanes, &c. Heretikes can neuer agree. The ſhort raigne of Heretikes. Heretikes preach without commiſſion. Heretikes do preferre the temporall raigne or ſwoorde before the ſpirituall. They are the members of Antichriſt, who withſtande the externall and publike ſacrifice of Chriſtes Church. Heretikes depriue Chriſte of his glorious inheritaunce in many nations togither. The intollerable pride of Heretikes, in making themſelues onely Iudges of the righte ſence of Gods word. The Proteſtants teach the ſame doctrine which the olde Heretikes did. The Proteſtants are the right members of An- Sander.

tichriſte, in that they ſpoyle Godes Church of very many giftes & graces & articles of the faith.

Fulke. HE maketh 11. markes of an Antichriſtian. The 1. is. They departe from the church as all heretiks doe. I aunſwere, the Proteſtantes haue not departed from the Church of Chriſt, but are gone out of the Church of Antechriſt, according as they are commaunded by the holy Ghoſt. *Apoc.* 18.4. & are returned to the church of Chriſt, which by the Pope & the deuill was driuen into the wildernes, *Apoc.* 12.6. But M. Sand. would haue the place named, where they dwelt, from whom the Pope departed, as though the place were materiall, when his departure from the doctrine of Chriſt, is manifeſt.

And Saint Paule propheſied of the greate Apoſtaſie and departing from Chriſt, which Antechriſt ſhoulde make. 2 *Theſſ.* 2. to him ſelfe & his owne doctrine, as Irenæus doeth expound it. *lib.* 5. & Baſi. *Ep.* 71. which all nations peoples & tongues ſhould embrace. *Apoc.* 18.3. therefore it were no maruaile, if no place could be named, altogeather voide of the infection of Antechriſt, eſpecially ſeeing the Church her ſelfe was driuen into the deſert, that is out of the ſight of men. yet there is no donbt, but God preſerued his Church, though in ſmall numbers, both in the Eaſt & in the Weſt. And namely one parte of the Church of God was in Britaine, both in Wales and Scotland, not ſubiect to the Pope, nor acknowledging his auctority, at ſuch time, as Auguſtine the monke came from Pope Gregory, & ſo continued longe after the reuelation of Antechriſt. *Bed. Hiſt. lib.* 2. *cap.* 2. *lib.* 3. *cap.* 25. And no doubt but the like was in many corners of the world.

The 2. marke of an Antechriſtian he maketh, to haue newe names after they be gone out of the Church, as, Lutherans, Zwinglians, &c. whereas they haue none but Catholikes, yes verely, the name of the Popiſh Church & Papiſtes, is as auncient as the name of Luther

ther & Lutherans, & more aunciente to. M.Sand.sayth we geue them these names of spight, eyght or nyne hundreth yeeres since the papacy Began. The lyke I say of them, who call vs Lutherans &c. of mere malice, when we are nothing but Christians, wherefore the tryall must be in the doctrine, which either sorte professe, and not in names.

The Christians of the Arians were called Homousians, Athanasians. &c. but the doctrine of the Catholike Christians agreeing with the woordes of God proued them to be no sectaryes nor Hetetikes, so doth our doctrine iustifie vs what names soeuer be deuised against vs. But Maister Sander woulde haue vs to shewe a man, whose proper name was Papa or Romanus as though many Heretikes were not called of their heariſie or place from whence they came, and not of proper names of men. Angelici, Apostolici, Barbarita, Cathari, Collyridiani, Encratitæ, Patripassiani and a great number more were called of their heresie, Cataphryges, Pepuziani and such like were called of the place where they were. Wherefore the name of Papistes and Romanistes agreeth with the example of olde heretikes. As for the longe tarying, large spreadinge, and straunge commng in of the Popishe heresie, is therefore without example, in all poyntes lyke, because Antichrist is not a common petiit heretike, but the greateſt and most daungerous enemy that euer the Gospel had.

The names of Benedictines, Fraunciscanes &c. Maister Sander woulde excuse, because these sectes maintaine no doctrin, dissenting frō the Pope, but all seeke the perfectiou of the Gospell by diuerse wayes, as though there were any other way but Iesus Christ. Sainct Paule 1.Cor.1. condemneth the holding of Peter, of Paule, of Apollo, when the Doctrine was all one, and counteth them schismatikes, that so did. And the purer Primatiue church, condemned such apish immitators of the Apostles in forsaking all things and

poſſeſſing nothing, in abſtayning from Marriage &c. for Heretikes, and called them Apoſtolicos, witneſſe Epiphan. *Cons. Apoſto. hær. 61.*

The thirde Marke of an Antichriſtian, is, diſſagreement among Heretikes: and heere not content to charge vs with the diſſagreeing of Anabaptiſtes from vs, he amplyfieth the diſſention betweene Luther and Zwinglius, about the preſence of Chriſtes body in the ſacrament, for which contradiction, he thinketh it muſte needes followe that one of them is an Antichriſte.

I aunſwere euery errour ſtifely mayntayned, maketh not an Heretike, except it be in an article of fayth neceſſary to ſaluation.

Cyprian againſte the Byſhopps of Rome Stephanus and Cornelius, helde an errour in Baptiſme, as greate as that ſame of Luther, diſſenting from Zwinglius in the Supper of the Lorde, yet is not Cypryan accoumpted for an Heretike. Maiſter Sander replyeth and ſayeth, that Cyprian was not ſo ſtubborne, that he woulde excommunicate them that held the contrary.

Luther alſo and Zwinglius, althoughe they coulde not bee reconcyled in opinions, yet agreed to abſtaine from contention, at Marpurge Anno domini. 1529 Sleid. lib. 6. Maiſter Sander ſayth, further, that in the contention of Cyprian, and Stephanus, the Catholike Faythe was not fully and vniuerſally receiued in any generall Councell. But hee forgeteth that the Byſhoppe of Rome was one partie, whoſe iudgement ſhould haue ended the ſtriefe if his authoritie had beene ſuch then, as he vſurped moſte ambiciouſly afterward.

Nowe where as he defendeth the Papiſts for their vnitie, which he ſayeth, could not bee with out the ſpirite of God, I aunſweare he might as well defend the Doctrine of the Mahometiſtes, where is greater vnitie then euer there was amonge the Papiſtes: who

to

to omit an hundreth ſmall contentions of the ſchoolemen, are not yet agreed, of the greateſt queſtion of all, whether the Pope be aboue the councell or the councell aboue the Pope. For ſeeing ſome of the Papiſtes, make the Popes determination to be the rule of truth, other make the councell, there is no vnitie among the Papiſtes in truth, when they are not agreed what is the onely rule of trueth: whereas we all agree, that the word of God is the only rule of truth, wherby we would haue all doctrine tried and examined.

The fourth marke of an Antichriſt, is, to reigne but a ſhort tyme, and here he woulde haue vs to marke howe Luthers kingdome is come to an ende, whoſe doctrine Melancthon hath chaunged although Illyricus woulde defend it. What depe roote ỹ doctrine of God deliuered by Luther, hath taken, it is ſo well knowne, that it can not be diſſembled. Neither hath Melancthon departed from him, except it were in his opinion of the reall preſence. Wherefore this is a great impudency, to triũphe ouer the decay of Luthers doctrine, which dayly encreaſeth, to the ouerthrow of the Popiſh kingdom.

The fall of Hoſiander an heretike, no man either marueleth or pitieth. The doctrine of Zwinglius and Oecolampadius of the Sacrament is the ſame that Caluine teacheth, as euery wiſe man doth know, and their learned workes ſhall liue and be in honor, when the Popes decretalls and his Maſſe bookes &c. ſhall ſtoppe muſtard pottes, and be put to viler vſes.

Neither is Caluines doctrine failed, by our othe of ſupremacie, for Caluine in the right ſence of it, taught the ſame ſupremacie of Chriſtian Princes which we ſweare to acknowledge, in our ſoueraigne.

Neither doth Beza teache any otherwiſe of the deſcending of Chriſt into hell, then Caluine did, nor otherwiſe expounded the place of the Pſalme, cited in Actes the 2. then Caluine doth, as all men that wil read them both may ſee, notwithſtanding the ſhameleſſe cauill of M. Sander.

The long continuaunce of the Popish kingdome, is a small cause to bragge of, when it being found enemie to the kingdome of Christ, is nowe entered so farre into destruction, out of which it shall neuer escape, although Maister Sander sayth it doth florish, when it is banished out of so many regions and dayly decreaseth in euerie place, Gods holy name be praised therefore.

The fift marke of Antichrist (he sayeth) is to preach without commission, as Luther did, who was sent of none. I aunswere in the state of the church, so miserablie deceaued, as it was in his time, God sendeth extraordinarily, immediatly from him selfe, as Helias & Helizæus & the Prophetes were sent to the Iewes & Israelites, which were not of the Priests & ordinary teachers, so Christ sent his Apostles and Euangelists. And so was Luther and such as he sent to repaire the ruines of the churche. And yet the Papistes haue small aduauntage against the calling of Luther, seeing he was a Doctor, authorised to preache in that church, where he first beganne, which after he had reformed the abuses therof, and restored true doctrine in many poyntes banished, by the false doctrine of Antichrist. The same reformed church hath euer since sent forth ordinarie pastors and teachers and shall doe to the end of the world.

The sixt *marke of an Antichrist is, that heretikes preferre the temporall sword before the spirituall. And therefore Antichrist shall by force of armes compell men to a new faith, for he shall come as S. Paule sayeth in virtute, that is to say in power or strength.* O impudent falsifier of the holy Scripture, doth not Sainct Paule say that his comming shalbe according to the efficacy of Satan in all power & signes and lying wonders, & in al deceitfulnes of vnrighteousnes, 2. *Thes.* 2, by which is shewed seduction by false doctrine, but he shall mainteine his kingdom by cruelty, as it is manifest in the Reuelation *cap.* 13. *&* 17. &c. But M. Sander hath a great quarel against the B. of Winchester for saying in his booke against Feckenham, *that the ciuil Magistrate, may visit, correct, reforme and depose any Bishop*

in

in their owne realme. Which is directly to say that the power of the King is higher and greater in Gods churche, then the power of a Bishop. And what inconuenience is this, in thinges perteining to his office, seeing that the Bishops power in his spirituall office of preaching ministring &c. is confessed to be aboue the King? Hereby we make the body aboue the soule (saith M. Sander) the tẽporal reigne aboue the kingdom of heauen. Not a whit, no more thẽ Salomon in deposing Abiather, & Christiã Emperors in deposing proude Bishops of Rome. Onely this we say, that M. Sander dissembleth. The cause must be iust, for which ỹ King shoulde depose a Bishop or pastor, for I thinke there is equall right in deposing of the greatest Bishop, & the poorest Priest from his benefice. This latter was alwaies lawful by the cõmon lawes vpon iust cause. Now if the cause be iust, it must be either manifest or doubtfull. If it be manifest as Abiathers was for murther, treason, adulterie, &c. the King obseruing the processe of the lawe, as in all other mens causes, may proceede against a Bishop. If the cause be doubtfull, it is either for life or doctrine. The triall of the Bishops life, ought to be as all other mens are, with due cõsideration of his accusers. The triall of doctrine is not in the Kings knowledge ordinarily but in the knowledge of the eccle siasticall state, who are iudges of the doctrine by reason of their knowledge, & to depose him from his ministery by reason of their calling, if he be culpable, and the King hath power to exclude him frõ his place & from his life also if his offence deserue it. But that in spiritual matters the King should rule ỹ Bishops, & pastors otherwise then Gods word woulde haue them ruled, none of vs did euer affirme: for that were tyranny & not Christian gouernment. And of such tyranny of Constantius the Arrian Emperour, doth Athanasius complaine: *In Epist. ad sol. vit. agent.* and shew the iudgement & aunsweres of the Christian Bishops, Paulinus, Lucifer, Eusebius, Dionysius, Liberius, Hosius, vnto him, when he would haue enforced them to subscribe against Athanasius, for defen-

ding the eternall diuinitie of our Sauiour Christ.

But yet the same Athanasius, appealed, him selfe, to the godly Emperor Constantinus the great, although in the end the Emperour being caried away by multitude of false witnesses, as any mortall mā may be, & deceiued, as Dauid was about Mephibosheth, gaue wrong sentéce against him *Socr. lib. 1. ca. 34.* And whē the same Emperor in his letters before, threatned to depose him, if he were disobediēt, he neuer repined but acknowledged his auctority. *Si cognouero quòd aliquos eorum qui ecclesiæ studeant* " *prohibueris, aut ab accessu ecclesiæ exclusseris, missā euestigio* " *qui te meo iussu deponas ac loco tuum transferas.* If I shall " know (sayth the Emperour) that thou wilt prohibit any " of them that fauour the church or exclude them from " entring into the churche, I will sende one immediatly " which shall depose thee by my commaundement, & re- " moue thy place. *Socr. li. 1. ca. 27.* Thus Athanasius iudging Constantius the hereticall Prince for an Antichristian image, in vsurping auctority in matters of faith against the truth, obeieth Constantinus a defender of the truth, & seeketh aide of his auctority in ecclesiasticall causes, according to the truth: M. Sander fearing we would obiect against him that Constantinus, Martianus, & other godly Emperors, vsed to sit in generall coūcels with the Bishops, replieth, that it was only to kepe peace, wheras they did not only kepe peace, but also prescribe & commaūd the Bishops, to proceede according to Gods word as Constantine did in the Nicene councell. *Euangelici e-* " *nim &c. The bookes of the Gospells & of the Apostles & the* " *oracles of the auncient Prophetes do plainly instruct vs in the* " *vnderstanding of God. Therfore setting all hatefull discord a-* " *side, let vs take out of the sayinges of Gods spirite, the explica-* " *tion of the questions.* They did also publish the decrees of the councell by their auctoritie, like as they called the councells together to make their decrees.

But Ambrose sayth *Ep. 32.* that euen an heretical Emperour comming to yeares of discretion, will be able to consider, *what maner a Bishop he is, who layeth the Priestly*

right

right vnder the lay mens feete. By which (saith M. Sander) you may see what maner a Bishop M. Horne and his fellowes be, w geue the most proude & intollerable title of supreame head & gouernor, to lay Princes. I answere in geuing this title, they meane to take nothing from the right of the clergie, & cõfesse with Augustine, that there is no greater then a Priest in his office, although Moses after the distinction was no Priest, but a ciuil Magistrate & in his calling aboue Aaron, that was high Priest. And although M. Sander say, this is the diuinity of England only, to acknowledge the Prince to be chiefe gouernor, he sayeth most vntruly, for all learned men of all countries, doe acknowledge the same, in such sorte as we do in England, and not as he in Flanders, either dreameth or slaundereth vs to do. For we confesse with Valentinian the good Emperour, that the Prince must submit his head to his godly pastor, in matters perteyning to his spirituall power *Theodor. lib. 4. cap. 5.* And yet we allowe the same Valentinian writing to the Bishoppes of Asia and Phrigia *Theodor. lib. 4. cap. 8. Qui omnes noxios dæmones student abigere precibus suis &c.* They which studie by their prayers to driue awaye all hurtfull deuells, knowe to submit them selues to publike offices, according to the lawes, they speake not against the Emperors power, but they keepe the commaundementes of a sincere and great Emperour, and the commaundementes of God, and are subiect to our lawes, but you are found disobedient. Finally we neuer ment, to geue the Prince by flatterie, auctoritie in suche matters as belong to Bishops alone, neither would we haue a confusion, of the office of an Emperour and a Bishop, wherefore neither the saying of Leontius to Constantius, nor of Eulogius to Valens which were both heretikes & would enforce men to receaue the heresie of Arrius, doth any thing at all touch vs, who limit the supremacie of Princes, within the compase of Gods worde, and Christian religion, against which, neither Prince nor Priest hath any auctoritie to commaund.

The ſeuenth marke of Antichriſt is, the withſtanding of the externall and publike ſacrifice of the church, by which he meaneth the ſacrifice of the Maſſe. Nay rather it is a ſetting vp of a new altare & ſacrifice propitiatorie, againſt the only propitiatory ſacrifice of Chriſtes death once offred, by which one oblation he hath made perfect for euer, them that are ſanctified *Heb.* 10. The auctor of this ſacrifice, which is the Pope, he is in deede Antichriſt the ſonne of perdition.

But Maiſter Sander for proofe of the ſacrifice of the Maſſe, alleageth the prophecie of Malachie *cap.* 1. with 16. fonde compariſons of the defectes of the Iewes, and the perfection of the Gentiles, which he affirmeth to be the *vniforme interpretation of the auncient fathers, of whom no one denyeth the body and blood of Chriſt to be here ment, albeit ſome of them expoundeth this prophecy of prayers and inwarde righteouſnes which are alwayes ioyned with the vnbloody ſacrifice.* I aunſwer no one of the auncient fathers, vnderſtandeth this prophecy of the ſacrifice of Chriſtes body and blood, otherwiſe then of a ſacrifice of prayſe and thankes giuing, for proofe whereof, I muſt referre the reader to myne aunſwer to M. Heſkins *lib.* 1. *cap.* 33. 34. 35. & 36. where he ſhall finde the places of the Doctors ſet downe, which are by M. Sander in place onely quoted.

But one other ſtraunge reaſon of M. Sander to proue the ſacrament of the Lords ſupper to be a ſacrifice propitiatory, I may not omit becauſe I remember not that I haue reade it before. *Euery publike and externall facte which is made by Gods authoritie to put vs in minde of that great ſacrifice, once fulfilled on the croſſe, muſte alſo be partaker of the nature of that Sacrifice whereof it is a remembraunce. As if the killing of a Calfe, which ſignifyed the death of Chriſte, was an externall ſacrifice, how infinitely more ſhall the body and blood of Chriſt beeing made of bread and wine, to ſignifie his owne death be a publike and external ſacrifice.*

This reaſon M. Sander maketh no ſmall account of.

But how beastly an absurditie his principle is you shall easily perceiue, if you consider, that Baptisme is a publike and externall fact made by Gods authoritie, to put vs in minde of the death and bloodshedding of Christ, yet no man was euer so mad, to say baptisme is a sacrifice. Againe the Calfe that was killed was by Gods appointment a sacrifice of the only & singular sacrifice of Christes death, & not by vertue of the signification, for the Iewes had other ceremonies then sacrifices, which did signifie the death of Christ: But the Lords supper is not by Gods appointment a sacrifice, therefore the signification cannot make it so.

The 8. mark of the false prophets of Antichrist, is to spoyle Christ of his inheritance, which God gaue him in all nations, as the Protestants doe, *VVhich for 8. or 9. hundreth yeres, can not shew any nation, town or village, church or chappel in the wide worlde, where they had publike prayer.* I answere, seeing the spirit speaketh expressely, of a generall Apostacy, and of the flying of the Church into the desert, it is no more derogation to the inheritaunce of Christ, that his Church among many nations was in persecution vnder Antichrist for 7. or 8. hundreth yeeres, then that the same was in persecutiō vnder the heathen Emperors, for 300. yeeres and more. For the nations were then the inheritance of Christ, in as glorious wise as when the Church flourished in outward peace vnder the Christiā Emperours, Yet was there townes & countryes, not only in Fraunce, Italie, and Germany, but also in the east parte of the worlde, great nations, among w Christ had a visible Church, which were neuer subiecte to the churchof Rome. If M.S. reply that they held some errors which we deny, as prayer for the dead &c. I answere, holding the onely foundation Iesus Christe, they might be true Christians, although they were infected with some such errors as these.

The 9. Mark of Antichrist is, *intollerable pride, to make him selfe iudge of the sence of Gods word, and of the text also.* I allowe this marke, & it agreeth to none that euer was

V.

ſo aptly, as to the Pope, whom the Papiſtes affirme, that he cā not erre in the ſence of the Scripture, who affirme that he hath auctoritie to receaue & reiect what bookes of Scripture he wil. But M. Sāder ſaith this note agreeth to vs, and that we make our ſelues iudges of the ſenſe of Gods word, and of the text. But we vtterly deny that: for we make the ſpirit of God in his worde, iudge of the interpretation. No ſayth M. Sander, & bringeth an exāple of theſe words of S. Paul. *He that ioyneth his virgin in mariage doth well, and he that ioyneth her not doth better.* Here vpon (ſaith he) we grounde this doctrine, *Virginitie is a better ſtate and more acceptable to God, then the ſtate of mariage.* This we graunt in ſome reſpect, as the Apoſtle ſpeaketh, but not ſimpyl. The queſtion is of theſe words, *he doth better* what is ment thereby: M. Sander chargeth vs to ſay, that S. Paule meaneth he doth better in the ſight of the worlde, which is an impudent lye, and therefore al his fooliſh dialogiſme, is a fighting with his owne ſhadow. Beza expoūdeth *he doth better* that is *more commodiouſly*, not in reſpect of the worlde, but in reſpect of godlines, for the reaſons before alleaged by S. Paul, & S. Paul him ſelfe is auctor of this interpretatiō verſe 35. of that 7. chap. 1. Cor. *This I ſay for your commodity*, when he exhorteth to virginity. And that his purpoſe was not abſolutely and ſimply, to preferr virginity aboue mariage, as a thing of it ſelfe more acceptable to God, it is plaine by theſe words. Firſt he ſaith, of virgines, I haue no commaundement of the Lorde. But he hath a commaundement, to preferre thoſe things that are moſt acceptable to the Lord. Secondly he ſayth: I ſuppoſe this to be good for the preſent neceſſity, by which words he doth emply, that it is not alwaies & abſolutly better, but at ſomtimes & in ſome reſpectes, for them that haue the gift of continence, and for none other. So we holde virginity to be better then mariage, according to the meaning of the beſt auncient writers, whereof ſome were too great extollers of virginitie, yet not like the Papiſtes.

But M. Sander ſayeth the Proteſtantes make them ſelues

ſelues Iudges, not only of the meaning of Gods worde, but alſo of the bookes them ſelues. For they reiect not only the book of wiſdom, Tobie & the Machabees, with other ſuch bookes, but alſo the Epiſtle of S. Iames. Nay rather the Pope is Antichriſt, for receauing theſe books of Wiſedom, Tobie, Machabees, ẅ were neuer receaued of the church of the Iſraelits, nor of the vniuerſal church of Chriſt for Canonicall Scripture, as I haue often ſhewed. And as touching ỹ Epiſtle of S. Iames, it is a ſhameleſſe ſlaunder of him to ſay, that the Proteſtantes reiect it, but we muſt heare his reaſon. Firſt Luther calleth it a ſtrawen Epiſtle. So Luther called the Pope ſupreame heade of the church, and the Maſſe a ſacrifice propitiatorie, if Proteſtantes be charged to holde whatſoeuer Luther ſometime helde, and after repented. But the confeſſion of Zurich with the conſent of the churches of Heluetia and Sabaudia, writeth thus, of it. *Iacobus ille dixit &c. That Iames ſayed, that workes doe iuſtifie, not ſpeaking againſt Sainct Paule, otherwiſe he were to be reiected.* Here ſaith M. Sãder, they thinke it poſſible, that S. Iames might be contrarie to Sainct Paule, and ſo his Epiſtle to be no holy Scripture. A wiſe collectiõ I promiſe you. S. Paule him ſelfe ſayed. If I my ſelfe or an Angell from heauen, ſhould preach any other Goſpel then you haue already receaued, let him be accurſed. Ergo S. Paul thought it was poſſible, ỹ him ſelfe or an Angell ſhoulde be auctor of a new Goſpel, & ſo his preaching ſhould not be ỹ Goſpel. Who ſeeth not ỹ madnes of this cõſequẽce.

But S. Iames his epiſtle (he ſayth) hath alwayes bene clearely admitte d among true Catholikes, & for witnes hereof he quoteth moſt impudenly Euſeb. lib. 1. ca. 23. in which booke and chapter, Euſebius clearely affirmeth that it is a counterfet epiſtle. I ſay not this to allowe the iudgment of Euſebius, but to ſhewe the impudencie of M. Sander. But he ſaith we reiect S. Iames becauſe he is contrary to our deuileſh doctrin of only faith. We teach only faith none otherwiſe, thẽ the apoſtle teacheth, that a man is iuſtified by faith, without workes. We teach

not that a man is iuſtified bya dead faith,which is voide of good workes, but by a liuing faith which worketh by loue. We ſay with Sainct Iames, if a man ſay he haue faith and hath not workes,his faith ſhall not ſaue him. For Abrahãs faith, which was imputed to him for righteouſnes by God, was not without good workes, as appeared by his obedience in offering his ſonne, wherein God tried him, neither to know him,nor to iuſtifie him, whom he knew and iuſtified before, but to ſhewe his obedience & to iuſtifie him before men. So it is true that S. Iames ſayeth a man is iuſtified of workes and not of faith onely. For a ſolitarie frutles faith doth not iuſtifie before God,but a faith which is fruteful in good workes is the onely inſtrument to apprehend iuſtification, and the workes as Auguſtine ſayth follow and ſhewe a iuſtified man they goe not before to iuſtifie. Thus our doctrine agreeth verie well with the Epiſtle of S. Iames & Sainct Paules doctrine,wherefore we haue no neede to reiect the Epiſtle of Sainct Iames, as contrarie to our doctrine.

But the Proteſtantes do not onely make them ſelues iudges of the whole bookes,but alſo ouer the very letter (ſaith he) of Chriſts Goſpell finding fault with the conſtruction of the Euangeliſts,and bring the text it ſelfe in doubt.Example hereof he bringeth:Beza in his annotations vpon *Luk* 22.of the words:This cup is the new Teſtamẽt in my blood which is ſhed for you.In which text, becauſe the word blood in the Greke,is the datiue caſe, the other worde that followeth is the nominatiue caſe, Beza ſuppoſeth that S. Luke vſeth a figure called Solœcophanes,which is appearaunce of incongruity,or elſe that the laſt worde which is *ſhed for you*, might, by error of writers,being firſt ſet in the margẽt out of Mathew & Marke, be remoued into the text. Hereupon M. Sander out of all order & meaſure,raileth vpon Beza & vpon al Proteſtantes.But I pray you good Sir,ſhall the only opinion of Beza,& that but a doubtful opiniõ,indite all the Proteſtants in the world of ſuch high treaſon againſt the

word

worde of God? For what gaineth Beza by this interpretation? Forsooth the Greeke text is contrary to his Sacramentary heresie. For thus he should translate it: *This cuppe is the newe Testament in my blood which cuppe is shed for you.* Not the cup of gold or siluer (saith he) but the liquor in that cuppe, which is not wine because wine was not shed for vs, but the bloode of Christ. Why then the sence is this. This blood in the cup which is shed for you is the newe Testament in my blood. What sence in the world cā these words haue? By which it is manifest, that the words *which is shed for you* cā not be referred to the cup, but to his his blood. For the cup was the newe Testamēt in his blood, which was shed for vs, which sense no man can deny, but he that will deny the manifest word of God. Neither doth the vulgare Latine translation geue any other sense, although M. Sander is not ashamed to say it doth. The vulgare Latine text is this. *Hic est calix nouum Testamētum in sanguine meo qui pro vobis fundetur.* What grammarian in construing, would referre *qui* to *calix* and not rather to *sanguine.* Againe Erasmus translateth it euen as Beza. *Hoc poculum nouum Testamentum per sanguinem meum qui pro vobis effundetur.* Now touching the coniecture of Beza, that those words by errour of the scriuener, might be remoued from the margent into the text, is a thing that somtime hath happened as most learned men agree, in the 27. of Mathew where the name of Ieremy is placed in ỹ text, for that w̄ is in Zachary, & yet neither of the Prophets was named by the Euangelist, as in most ancient recordes it is testified. The like hath bene in the first of Marke, where the name of Esay is sette in some Greeke copies, and followed in your vulgare translation, for that which is cited out of Malachie which name was not set downe by the Euangelist, but added by some vnskilfull writer, & is reproued by other Greke copies. But this place you say is not otherwise found in any old copy, as Beza confesseth: then remaineth ỹ second opinion, ỹ S. Luke in this place, vseth Solœcophanes w̄ is an appearance of incōgruity,

and yet no incongruitie. Wherein I can not marualye more at your malice (M. Sander) then at your ignorance, which put no difference betwene ſolœciſmus & ſolœcophanes, but euen as ſpitefully as vnlearnedly, you affirme that Beza ſhould teach, that S. Luke wrote falſe Greeke, whereas Solœcophanes is a figure vſed of the moſt eloquent writers that euer tooke penne in hande, euen Cicero, Demoſthenes, Greeke and Latine, prophane and diuine, and euen of S. Luke him ſelfe in other places, whereof for examples, I referre you to Budæus vpon the word Solœcophanes. The apparance of incongruitie is, that it ſeemeth, that τὸ ἐκχυνόμενον, which is the nominatiue caſe, ſhold agre with τῷ αἵματι, which is the datiue caſe, wheras in deed τὸ is vſed as a relatiue for ὃ, as it is often, and the verbe ἐστὶ which wanteth, is vnderſtoode, as it is commonly in the Greeke tongue, and ſo the tranſlation muſt be *hoc poculum nouum Teſtamentum eſt in ſanguine meo, qui pro vobis effundiur*, or *effuſus eſt*. So that this is nothinge els, but an impudent and vnſkillfull quarelling, againſt Beza, wheras you Papiſts defend againſt the manifeſt inſtitution of the cuppe, & the practiſe of the primitiue Church, the communion in one kind of bread onely *Con. Conſt. Seſſ.* 13. 21.

The tenth marke of an Antichriſtian *is to agree with the members of Antichriſt, which are heretikes*. To agree with them in hereſie is a poynt of Antichriſtianiſme, I confeſſe, but not to agree with them in any thing. For euery hereſy affirmeth things that are true. But let vs ſee in what points of hereſie he chargeth vs to agree with the olde heretikes. Firſt Eunomius ſayde, that no ſinne ſhould hurt him, if he were partaker of the faith which he taught, ſo the Proteſtants ſaye of their faith. Yea ſir, but their faith is not Eunomius faith, & yet they ſay not that no ſinne ſhall hurt them, but no ſinne ſhall condemne them: & ſo ſay you Papiſtes of your popiſh faith.

Secondly Aceſius the Nouatian Biſhop affirmed, that mortall ſinnes committed after baptiſme, might not be forgiue of the Prieſt, but of God alone. The Proteſtants deny

deny the Prieſt to haue any right to forgiue ſinnes. This is a lowd lye & falſe ſclaunder, for we hold that the miniſter of God, hath authoritie to forgiue all ſinnes, that God will forgiue, according to the power giuen to them *Ioan.* 20. But you Papiſtes agree with the heretike in this poynt, that you deny the Prieſt to forgiue all ſinnes according to the power giuen, but haue your *caſus Epiſcopales* & *Papales*, by which you abridge the power giuen by Chriſt.

Thirdly, the Meſſalians denyed that baptiſme doth plucke vp the roote of ſinnes, the ſame is the opinio of the Proteſtats. The Proteſtants haue none opinion common with the Meſſalians, who affirmed that our owne merits & ſatisfaction with prayers continual were neceſſary for plucking vp the roote of ſinnes, whereas we affirme, that baptiſme ſaueth vs according to the Scripture 1. *Pet.* 3. 21. by forgiuenes of our ſinnes, whereby euen the roote of ſinne is plucked vp, although cõcupiſcenſe remayne after the acte of baptiſme, which you Papiſtes alſo confeſſe to remayne & to be the roote of ſinne, although you graunt it not to be ſinne. But we limit not the effect of baptiſme, to the time paſſed before ỹ acte of baptiſme onely, as you doe, but extend it to our æternall ſaluation: he that beleueth & is baptiſed ſhall be ſaued. *Marke* 16. 16. Therefore you Papiſts both in this & in your cõtinual lipplabor maintained in your Abbeyes, agree with the Meſſalians.

Fourthly, Ærius taught, that we muſt not pray for the dead, nor keepe the accuſtomed faſtings, & that there is no difference betwene a Prieſt & a Biſhop. The ſuperſtition of praying for the dead, was iuſtly reproued by Ærius, ſo was the faſt of cuſtom and decree rather then of conſideration, for the firſt that praied for the dead were heretikes, Montaniſts, as Tertullian & his ſect, the firſt that made preſcript lawes of faſting, was Montanus the heretike alſo, as Euſebius witneſſeth *lib.* 5. *cap.* 18. Of the third opinion was Hierom Euagrio, affirming that the diſtinction was made by men and not by God.

Fifthly, Iouinian iudged virginitie equall with mariage, so doe the Protestants. I haue shewed before howe it is equall, and how it is superior.

Sixtly, S. Hierom reproueth Vigilantius of heresie, for denying prayer to Saincts, and giuing honour to reliques. For praying to Saincts, there is no mention in S Hierom, the immoderate honoring of reliques was iustly reproued, and yet it was not then the one halfe of that it hath bene since. Hieronym, although he rather rayle then reason against Vigilantius, as Erasmus hath noted: yet he defendeth not the adoration or worshipping, but the reuerent estimation of reliques.

Seuenthly, the Arrians would not beleue the consubstantiality of the same, because that word was not written in the Scripture. So do the Protestants deny many thinges vpon the like pretence. This is a meere sclaunder. for we stande vpon the sence of the Scripture, and not the wordes onely.

Eightly, Eusebius noteth it for an haynous impietie in Nouatus, that he was not consummate with crisme, " which the Protestants call greasing. In deede Cornelius Bishop of Rome reporteth that Nouatus was baptised in tyme of necessitie being very like to dye. *Iacens in " lecto pro necessitate perfusus fit, nec reliqua in eo qua baptismum subsequi solent solemniter adimpleta sunt: nec signaculo " Chrismatis consummatus fit: vnde nec spiritum sanctum vnquam potuerit promereri.* Lying in his bed according to the " necessitie he was baptised, nether were the other things " that are wont to follow baptisme solemnly fullfilled, nether was he consummate with y seale of Chrisme: wherby he could neuer obtayne the holy Ghost. First I saye this is noted as no impietie in Nouatus, but as a defect of necessitie. Secondly that the Chrisme which Cornelius speaketh of, was ether a seale of the extraordinarye gifts of the holy Ghost, which in some remayned in the Church vntill that tyme, or els he magnifieth that ceremony intollerably to deny the holy ghost to such as had it not, being none of the institution of Christ, and contrary to that the Papistes them selues hold at this day.

Ninethly

Ninethly, Lucius the Arrian persecuted holy Menkes, so doe the Protestants. Nay they punish none but filthy, idle, Idolaters, and hypocrites.

Tenthly, the Montanists and Luciferians sayd there was a stewes made of the Church. They sayde so falsly when the Churche was chaste. but Esaye sayde truely: how is the faithfull citie become an whore, when the Church of Israell was so in deede.

Eleuenthly, the Donatists sayd the Church was lost from all the world, & preserued only in Africa. So say the Protestants that the Church was lost in all partes of the world, and rayse vp againe in Germany. The Protestants say not so. For the Churche hath bene scattered ouer the face of the earth, since the first preaching of the Apostles vnto this day. But the Papistes saye that the Church was lost out of all the world and preserued only in a part of Europe, when of all partes in the world onely a part of Europe, which is the least part of the world, was subiect to the Church of Rome.

Twelfthly, the Semiarians vsed the law and the Prophets, but they peruerted the sense of the Scriptures by a certayne peculiar interpretation of their owne. So doe the Protestants. Nay so do the Papistes, that submitte all vnderstanding of the Scripture, be it neuer so playne, to the interpretation of their Pope, and popish Church: as the commaundement of Images forbidden, and the cuppe to be receyued of all, doe most manifestly declare.

Lastly, it hath alwayes bene a tricke of Iewes and heretikes to be still in hande with translating holy Scriptures, that by chaunging they may get some appearance of Scripture on their side, as Theodotion, Aquila, Symmachus. So doe the Protestants now. Hieronym was no heretike, yet did he translate the Scriptures both into Latine and into the Dalmatian tongue. And the Papistes haue played the part of Antichristian heretikes, to confirme the vulgare Latine translation, which is so manifestly corrupt and false, contrary to the truth of the Hebrue and Greeke textes vpon pretence of auoyding vncertaynty of translatiõs, wher-

as there is none so bad, as that.

I might heere runne through a great number of the olde heresies, in which the Papists consent with the ancient Heretikes. The Valentinians in their crosse. Montanistes in their purgatory, and prescript fastings. Carpocratians in their images. The Hemerobaptists in their holy water. The Ossenes and Marcosianes in their reliques and straunge tounge in prayers. The Heracleanites in annoynting them that are redy to dye. The Caians in praying to angels. The Archonticks in their counterfaite mōkery. The Marcionists in extolling virginitie & fasting, & in permitting women to Baptize. The Enctatits in abstaining from flesh. The Apostoliks in their vowe of continence. The Cyrians in worshipping the virgine Mary. The Pelagians in their opinion of merites and freewill. The Eutychians in denyinge the truethe of Christe his bodye. The Anthromorphites in making Images of God, and many other, but that I haue doone it elsewhere, more at large. But of these, Epiphanius, Augustine, and others are witnesses.

The 11. and last marke is, *that Antichristians shoulde goe about to make voyde, and deny the supernaturall graces which God hath giuen to his Church, so that the seale of Antichrist by Hippolitus iudgement should be Nego I deny. So doe the Protestants which deny fiue sacraments of the church, the sacrifice of the Masse, &c.* And so maketh rehearsall of a greatnumber of popish errors, which indeed we deny, because they be contrary to the trueth of Gods worde. Among which he rehearseth some false and shameless slaunders, as, *that we denye our sinnes to be taken away by the Lambe of God, saying they tary still but that they are not imputed.* In deed, if we say we haue no sinne, we deceiue our selues, and the trueth is not in vs. But we say all the sinnes that we haue, are taken away, when they are not laid to our charge.

Secondly he chargeth vs to teach, *That no iustice is at all made in vs by spreading charitie in our hearties, Where-*

as S.

as S. Paule saith Rom. 5. many shalbe made iust: but they say onely that Iustice shall be imputed. We say with Sainct Paule Rom. 5. that beeing iustifyed by faith we haue peace with God, reioycing in hope, which doth not confound vs in the middest of afflictions, because the loue of God is powred foorth in our heartes. I meane the loue of God towarde vs, and not our loue towarde him. Wee say likewise with Sainct Paule, that by the obedience of one which is Christe, many shalbe made righteous. But howe can we be made righteous by obedience of Christe, but that his obedience is imputed and made perfecte vnto vs? O putide and absurde slaunders.

He chargeth vs thirdly, that wee deny Baptisme, to remit our sinnes, which is false, excepte as Sainct Peter denyeth the woorke wroughte to saue vs. 1. Pet. 3. verse 21. not the washing of the filth of the body, but the aunsweare of a good conscience vnto Almightie God.

Fourthly, he chargeth vs to deny that Baptisme is necessary to Children, which are borne of christian Parentes wherein he lyeth moste impudently: although wee agree not with the Papistes that the Infantes of Christians excluded by necessitie from Baptisme, are damned. In which errour although Augustine was, yet he is no more to be followed, then in an other errour, about the same infantes, to whome bothe he and Pope Innocentius thought the Sacrament of the Lordes Supper as necessarye as the Sacrament of Baptisme, affirming that Infantes whiche haue not receiued the Lordes Supper were damned. Contra duas Epist. Pelag. ad Bonifac. lib. 2. cap. 4. *Ecce beate memoriæ Innocentius Papa sine Baptismo Christi & sine participatione corporis & sanguinis Christi vitam non habere paruulos dicit.* Beholde Pope Innocente of blessed memory sayeth, that without the Baptisme of Christe, and the participation of the body and bloode of Christe, little Children haue no lyfe.

To conclude, we deny nothing that they can proue to be true, but ſuch matters as we proue by the onely rule of trueth to be falſe. But the Pope ſheweth himſelf to be Antichriſt, which denyeth al the ſoueraignitie of the office and prerogatiue of Chriſt.

He denyeth that Chriſte is the onely heade of his vniuerſall Church in Heauen and in earth.

He denyeth that Chriſt onely is a Prieſte, according to the order of Melchizedech.

He denyeth that Chriſt onely is our Mediatour, aſwell of interceſſion, as of redemption,

He denyeth that Chriſts woorde is ſufficient for our ſaluation.

He denyeth that the ſacrifice of Chriſte his death is the onely purgation of our ſinnes.

He denyeth that the merites of Chriſt are our onely iuſtification.

He denyeth that God onely is to be prayed vnto.

He denyeth the veritie of Chriſtes bodye by his tranſubſtantiation.

Finally he denyeth all honor and glory to be dewe onely to God by Ieſus Chriſt, and therefore he is none other, but euen that deteſtable monſter Antichriſte whome I beſeech the Lord, ſpeadely to confound and aboliſh by the ſpirit of his mouth which is his holy woorde, and by the brightneſſe of his comming.

Amen.

God be prayſed.

LIBRARY OF THE
UNION
THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY
NEW

T. V.